
Staff Response
to the
Environmental Quality Advisory Council's
Annual Report on the Environment
2005



Prepared by the
Environmental Coordinating Committee
for the
Fairfax County Board of Supervisors
March 27, 2006

Staff Response
to the
Environmental Quality Advisory Council's
Annual Report on the Environment
2005



Prepared by the
Environmental Coordinating Committee
for the
Fairfax County Board of Supervisors
March 27, 2006

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

Gerald E. Connolly, Chairman
Sharon Bulova, Braddock District, Vice Chairman

Joan DuBois,
Dranesville District

Gerald R. Hyland
Mount Vernon District

Michael R. Frey
Sully District

Dana Kauffman
Lee District

Penelope A. Gross
Mason District

Elaine McConnell
Springfield District

Catherine M. Hudgins
Hunter Mill District

Linda Q. Smyth
Providence District

ENVIRONMENTAL COORDINATING COMMITTEE

Robert A. Stalzer, Chairman
Deputy County Executive

Kambiz Agazi,
Environmental Coordinator

Fairfax County Attorney's Office
Fairfax County Department of Health
Fairfax County Department of Housing and Community Development
Fairfax County Department of Management and Budget
Fairfax County Department of Planning and Zoning
Fairfax County Department of Public Works and Environmental Services
Fairfax County Department of Transportation
Fairfax County Department of Vehicle Services
Fairfax County Fire and Rescue Department
Fairfax County Office of Public Affairs
Fairfax County Park Authority
Fairfax County Police Department
Fairfax County Public Schools
Fairfax County Water Authority
Northern Virginia Soil and Water Conservation District
Virginia Department of Transportation



County of Fairfax, Virginia

MEMORANDUM

DATE: March 22, 2006

TO: Board of Supervisors

FROM: Anthony H. Griffin
County Executive

SUBJECT: Agency Responses to the Environmental Quality Advisory Council
Recommendations Contained within the 2005 Annual Report on the Environment

On December 5, 2005, the Environmental Quality Advisory Council (EQAC) presented its Annual Report on the Environment to the Board of Supervisors. The chapters in the EQAC report are arranged to reflect the order of topics listed in the Board of Supervisors' Environmental Agenda (Environmental Excellence for Fairfax County: *A 20-Year Vision*). The EQAC report included recommendations in areas of: Land Use and Transportation; Air Quality; Water Resources; Hazardous Materials; Ecological Resources; Wildlife Management; and Noise, Light, and Visual Pollution. Consistent with last year's effort, the Environmental Coordinating Committee (ECC) circulated EQAC's recommendations among appropriate County agencies and organizations, and coordinated a collaborative staff response to each of the recommendations for consideration by the Board. The Board's Environmental Committee is scheduled to consider staff's responses on March 27, 2006.

The following County agencies were asked to respond to EQAC's recommendations:

- Department of Public Works and Environmental Services (DPWES)
- Department of Health (HD)
- Office of the County Attorney (CAO)
- Fairfax County Park Authority (FCPA)
- Department of Planning and Zoning (DPZ)
- Department of Systems Management for Human Services (DSMHS)
- Division of Animal Control, Police Department (PD)
- Department of Transportation (DOT)
- Office of Public Affairs (OPA)
- Office of the County Executive (CEO)
- Fire Prevention Division, Fire and Rescue Department (F&R)

Office of the County Executive
12000 Government Center Parkway, Suite 552
Fairfax, VA 22035-0066
703-324-2531, TTY 703-222-5494, Fax 703-324-3956
www.fairfaxcounty.gov

- Facilities Management Department
- Department of Information Technology
- Department of Tax Administration
- Sheriff's Office
- Environmental Coordinator

In addition, the Northern Virginia Soil and Water Conservation District (NVSWCD), the Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT), the Northern Virginia Conservation Trust (NVCT), and Fairfax County Public Schools (FCPS) were asked to respond to at least one recommendation each. In order to facilitate agency responses and EQAC's review of these responses, each agency was asked to complete individual response forms for each of the recommendations directed to it. Coordinated interagency responses were prepared for forty of EQAC's fifty-eight recommendations.

Each of the agencies listed above prepared its draft responses by January 27th 2006. In February and March 2006, the responses were reviewed by the County's Environmental Coordinating Committee (ECC), which is a collaborative interagency management committee chaired by Deputy County Executive Robert A. Stalzer. Among other responsibilities, this committee was established to ensure an appropriate level of coordination and review of the County's environmental policies and initiatives. This is the sixth year that the ECC has reviewed the EQAC recommendations. While individual agencies took the lead in preparing responses to EQAC recommendations, the responses reflect the views of the entire ECC. One of several objectives of the ECC is to coordinate among the various County agencies, support deliberations, and make recommendations to the County Executive with regard to issues and initiatives associated with environmental concerns, interests, and regulatory requirements as identified by County staff. The ECC has representation from the following agencies: Department of Public Works and Environmental Services; Department of Planning and Zoning; Department of Vehicle Services; Fairfax County Department of Transportation; Fairfax County Health Department; Fire and Rescue Department; Fairfax County Park Authority; Police Department; Office of Public Affairs; Fairfax County Water Authority; County Attorney's Office; Northern Virginia Soil and Water Conservation District; Department of Management and Budget; Fairfax County Public Schools; Virginia Department of Transportation; and the County Executive's Office.

A complete set of staff responses to EQAC's 2005 recommendations is enclosed as Attachment 1. The staff responses are provided in the same order as the corresponding recommendations in the Annual Report.

A number of responses to EQAC recommendations suggest actions that may have fiscal implications. Responses that have implications with respect to the FY 2007 budget are as follows:

- In response to Land Use and Transportation 1b (an EQAC recommendation addressing Plan monitoring issues), staff is anticipating a Plan monitoring effort in 2007. While detailed fiscal implications of the Plan monitoring process will not be known until the process has been better defined, it is anticipated that this effort can be undertaken with existing staff resources.
- EQAC's second Land Use and Transportation recommendation regarding the UDIS replacement resulted in funding in the FY 2007 Advertised Budget Plan to cover data storage, programming, and contractor/integration services. If the County decides to capture all planimetric data, including impermeable surfaces, for all parcels (new process), there are several resource and cost implications that have not yet been budgeted. These include, but are not limited to, the cost to procure Countywide aerial photography and convert all planimetric data, the cost to specify and implement a new process and model that requires submission of electronic site plans by developers (new), and the cost of 1-2 new GIS positions to capture all planimetric data from all parcels (new business process with functions not performed today). These requirements will be discussed in more detail in the response to the EQAC Land Use and Transportation recommendation #3b.
- The response to Land Use and Transportation 3b, which is related to Land Use and Transportation 2 in that it focuses on a parcel-based data system, indicates that updating the county's planimetric data at the parcel scale would require significant resources in the future. Staff has evaluated the estimated cost for updating the planimetric data for several scenarios as shown in the table below.

Estimated costs to update the county's planimetric data

Scenario	Estimated Cost
<i>Update the entire county, once</i>	
Base Planimetric data (see the table in the response to Land Use and Transportation recommendation 3b):	\$1,150,000
Additional cost for capturing pools, patios, decks, sheds, and tennis courts:	\$290,000
<i>Total: \$1,440,000</i>	
<i>Update twenty-five (25) percent of the county, on a four-year cycle</i>	
Base Planimetric data (again, see the response):	Varies by quadrant. Average: \$322,000
Additional cost for capturing pools, patios, decks, sheds, and tennis courts:	Varies by quadrant. Average: \$82,000
<i>Total annual average: \$404,000</i>	
<i>Total over four years: \$1,616,000</i>	

- The response to Land Use and Transportation 3c notes that funding was provided at the FY 2004 Carryover Review for transportation modeling to update the County's Transportation Plan. This effort is expected to be concluded at the end of FY 2006. Two sub-area studies were funded and initiated to be conducted concurrently with the Transportation Plan Update (the Tysons Corner Transportation & Urban Design Study and the Laurel Hill Transportation Analysis and Preliminary Engineering Study). The cost of each study was approximately \$400,000. While the transportation model will be a useful tool for county planners, no funds for conducting additional studies using the model have been budgeted for FY 2007 or subsequent years. Refining and using the transportation model to address issues that are identified during the Transportation Plan review would have budget implications in the future.
- In response to Land Use and Transportation 5a, in the past the Board has provided funding by magisterial district for trail projects. On November 2, 2004, County voters approved a \$165 million General Obligation Bond Referendum as part of the Board's four-year Transportation Plan. Within the Board's four-year Transportation Plan, \$10.8 million was designated to fund Countywide pedestrian improvements such as sidewalks and trails, and improvements for bus stops and crosswalks, as well as pedestrian improvements for the Richmond Highway Initiative. In addition, the Board of Supervisors appropriated funding of \$2.0 million in general funds as part of the FY 2004 Carryover Review for critical capital projects including streetlights, storm drainage, sidewalk, trail and walkway projects. Each Board member dedicated some of this funding for specific sidewalks and trails construction. As there are still numerous missing links along the major commuting and recreational trails in the County, both the Trails and Sidewalks Committee (formerly the Countywide Non-Motorized Transportation Committee) and the Pedestrian Task Force are currently developing a list of priority projects to be completed using both available and future funds to achieve a comprehensive interconnected trails system throughout the County. The Pedestrian Task Force completed the 10-year capital plan for pedestrian facilities in 2005. As additional resources will be needed to achieve improved pedestrian access and to provide a comprehensive, interconnected trails system throughout the County, continued funding of pedestrian improvements will be required.
- EQAC's first Water Resources recommendation strongly supports the need and importance to continue the dedication of a portion of the real estate tax for funding of the county's watershed protection and restoration needs. It should be noted that the County Executive has recommended in his FY 2007 budget to the members of the Board of Supervisors that one penny of the Real Estate Tax be dedicated for the stormwater management program. The total amount for FY 2007 is \$21.9 million. The funds are earmarked for watershed plan development, watershed plan implementation, and rehabilitation of the stormwater infrastructure. The FY 2007 Advertised Budget Plan also includes funding for 3 new staff positions to support the Stormwater management program.
- For several of EQAC's other Water Resources recommendations, staff is recommending the continuation of the development and implementation of watershed management plans for all

county watersheds, the incorporation of LIDs in the Public Facilities Manual, the implementation of initiatives associated with the Total Maximum Daily Load for Accotink Creek including bacteriological monitoring and outreach, and support for the county's MS4 permit program. These efforts will be funded (one penny from the real estate tax) using the dedicated funding for the stormwater program that is currently in the County Executive's FY 2007 budget.

- Approximately \$27,000 is included in the FY 2007 Advertised Budget Plan to support the existing Deer Management effort. It should be noted that the requirements of this program within the county have now exceeded the dedicated staff resources.
- An amount of \$35,140 is included in the FY 2007 Advertised Budget Plan, to support the existing Geese Management effort. It should be noted that the requirements of this program within the county have now exceeded the dedicated staff resources.
- EQAC's first Ecological Resources recommendation calls for the development and implementation of a countywide natural resources management plan. A comprehensive survey and mapping of vegetative ecosystems is funded and is being pursued by the Urban Forest Management Division of the Department of Public Works and Environmental Services. Interagency discussions are under way on the identification and consolidation of natural resource data that can be assessed in conjunction with the vegetation community data once these data are available. Interagency coordination efforts will proceed using existing staff resources. However, it is possible that an outcome of this coordination will be a request for consultant support at some time in the future.
- EQAC's second Ecological Resource recommendation supports the continuation of the public-private partnership between the Board of Supervisors and the Northern Virginia Conservation Trust (NVCT). NVCT has been an effective partner in protecting valuable environmental and heritage resources through negotiation of conservation easements, and staff supports the continuation of this partnership into the future. An amount of \$258,120 was included in the FY 2006 Adopted Budget Plan for the Northern Virginia Conservation Trust. The FY 2007 Advertised Budget Plan includes a contribution of \$266,380, allowing for approximately 3% growth to account for inflation. FY 2007 marks the seventh consecutive year that the county has funded the NVCT.
- The response to the first hazardous materials recommendation indicates that program implementation is funded by the county's solid waste management program. Staff anticipates that the necessary funding and staffing resources will be available. It should be noted that the requested funding covers outreach and education activities only, and does not include the cost of managing hazardous wastes delivered to County facilities. Typically, the businesses that generated these wastes pay for the cost of handling and disposal.

Responses that may require future funding considerations include the following:

- The response to the second and third Land Use and Transportation recommendations indicate that resources will need to be expended to provide continuing system support and maintenance and to provide for the updating of the data elements. The current intention would be to absorb this work through existing staffing levels. However, DPZ and DPWES have indicated that it may need additional staff resources to support their role in this new system.
- The response to Land Use and Transportation 5b indicates that there would be considerable fiscal impacts related to any expanded efforts to improve transit utilization through the development and implementation of systematic plans and initiatives, and even more with expanding service.
- In response to EQAC's Air Quality recommendations 2 and 3, the Health Department is continuing to look for funding opportunities to implement the remaining recommendations in the county's Air Quality Management Plan, and to continue the air quality outreach campaign to encourage residents and businesses to take voluntary actions to reduce the level of air pollutants. There is currently no funding in the FY 2007 Advertised Budget for this purpose.
- The response to the fourth Ecological Resources recommendation, which addresses the need for a permanent county soil scientist, notes that a soil scientist position within the NVSWCD is currently funded by the county through FY 2007. The soil scientist position is carrying out duties associated with mapping and updating the county soil survey as well as providing other services and advice on soils and LID bio-infiltration practices. The soil survey is scheduled to be completed by the end of FY 2007 at which time funding for the project and soil scientist position will cease. If the county decides that the expertise of a soil scientist position is needed beyond the soil survey completion date, a funding allocation would be needed in the FY 2008 budget.
- The response to the fourth Noise recommendation indicates that the availability of the third party financing mechanism for the construction of noise barriers has potential longer-range fiscal implications to the County for those projects which the County or VDOT funds for which the State Noise Abatement Policy is applicable. This is due to the fact that noise barriers which exceed VDOT's cost-effectiveness ceiling would not be constructed at all, i.e., there would be no cost to a project, if the third party financing option were not provided. In the case of third party financing, the project pays the base amount per receptor for the noise wall up to VDOT's cost-effectiveness ceiling with the third party financing the rest.

- The response to the second Light Pollution recommendation indicates that the specific actions being taken at this time do not have any impact on the FY 2007 Budget. However, it is estimated that approximately \$20 million would be needed to convert all the existing 43,000 semi-cutoff cobra head and colonial fixtures to cutoff fixtures. This does not include the cost to install additional cutoff fixtures that may be needed to meet the applicable lighting criterion, which in turn would increase the overall operation and maintenance costs. Currently, funds to convert the semi-cutoff fixtures to cutoff fixtures are not available or proposed in FY 2007. The response to the first Light Pollution recommendation, which addresses the new Zoning Ordinance outdoor lighting standards, notes that there may be potential longer range fiscal implications if the current outdoor lighting regulations are amended in such a way that requires additional staff resources to implement and/or enforce.
- The response to the second Visual Pollution recommendation notes that staff has begun work on the development of a program, which, if initiated, would serve as the basis for determining if and how the County should enforce the State's prohibition of advertising within highway rights-of-way. While progress has been made this year in the formulation of the program, it has been necessary to divert the staff resources responsible for this assignment to other pressing needs, principally to work on Zoning Ordinance amendments which have been given an extremely high priority by the Board. Additionally, the significant amount of time spent by the Zoning Administrator and management staff of the Zoning Enforcement Branch on such issues as work program changes, overcrowding, litigation efforts, and responding to the numerous "hot button" issues that invariably arise in the zoning administration line of business, has impacted their ability to invest the quality time necessary on this item. It is anticipated however, that by the spring of 2006, appropriate staff resources can again be devoted to this effort. To date, as part of the development of this program, staff contacted the staff of Prince William County, who recently implemented such a program. It is anticipated that county and other agencies will be included in the design of the program, including the Office of the County Attorney, the Department of Public Works and Environmental Services, the Virginia Department of Transportation, and the Office of the Sheriff. Staff will also develop a campaign to publicize the program and educate/inform the community and public agencies of the regulations and the enforcement effort. At the end of the first year of the program, the county will review the results of the program and make a determination if additional resources are required and consider possible retention, modification and/or expansion of the program. It should be noted that, prior to the implementation of any County enforcement of this measure, the Board would be required to hold a public hearing.

Please note that the above list includes only those items for which specific budget requests above and beyond current staffing levels may be anticipated in the future. Staff intends to devote significant efforts, using existing resources, to a number of matters addressed within EQAC's recommendations.

If you have questions about this item between now and March 27th, please contact Kambiz Agazi, Environmental Coordinator (324-1788). Thank you.

AHG: KA

Attachments: As Stated

cc: Environmental Quality Advisory Council
Environmental Coordinating Committee
Robert A. Stalzer, Deputy County Executive
Susan Datta, Director, Department of Management and Budget
Kambiz Agazi, Environmental Coordinator
Noel H. Kaplan, Senior Environmental Planner, Planning Division, DPZ

Response to 2005 EQAC Recommendation

Recommendation: Land Use and Transportation #1a (Land Use and Transportation Vision and Assessment)

(Page 36 of the Annual Report on the Environment)

EQAC Recommendation:

The current Fairfax County Comprehensive Plan traces its roots back to the PLUS program that culminated in 1975 and the “Goals for Fairfax County” adopted in 1988. Numerous reviews and regular updates have occurred over the past 30 years, yet as stated in the current Plan: “Many of the key components of the 1975 Plan remain in the revised Plan, such as the emphasis on focusing growth in “Centers”; decreasing automobile dependency; and protecting environmentally sensitive areas and stable neighborhoods. What has changed are some of the means to achieve these ends.”

As the county approaches build out, EQAC recommends that the county:

- a. Evaluate the State of the Plan and publish an updated version of the State of The Plan, An Evaluation of Comprehensive Plan Activities between 1990-1995 with an Assessment of Impacts through 2010 (published in 1996) to cover plan activities between 1995-2005 and assess impacts through 2025. The current process of reviewing each section does not provide a comprehensive review of the interrelationships between sections, especially Land Use and Transportation, and does not review the underlying principles of the Plan.

Lead agencies for this response: DPZ (Planning Division)

Coordinating agency(ies) for this response: DOT

Please identify a lead agency contact person: Sterling Wheeler

Has this recommendation already been addressed, or is it in the process of being addressed? If so, please provide details.

The State of the Plan document of 1996 provided information on how the Comprehensive Plan changed between 1990-1995 in terms of development potential (i.e., Plan build-out); an assessment of the degree to which the Comprehensive Plan’s goals, objectives and policies had been implemented; and, suggested new actions that should be pursued to improve the implementation of the Comprehensive Plan.

Plan Monitoring activities in 2003 started to address a key element of this recommendation by evaluating Comprehensive Plan amendments adopted between 1995 and 2003. The Plan

Land Use and Transportation #1a Continued

amendments adopted between 1995 and 2003 were quantified and used to estimate how the Plan's build-out potential had changed. This information assisted staff in updating the county's employment forecasts.

Last year when staff responded to a similar EQAC recommendation, the publishing of the analysis of Plan changes (1995-2003) was anticipated in late 2005; however, due to the need to shift staff resources to other planning efforts, the Plan change analysis document has not been completed. Based on current staff resources, it is anticipated that this document will be completed by early 2007 and it will incorporate Plan amendments associated with the 2004 North County Area Plans Review and the 2005/2006 South County APR. This effort addresses a portion of recommendation #1a.

In addition, the replacement of the Urban Development Information System with an integrated parcel lifecycle system, as discussed under Land Use and Transportation recommendation #2, will significantly improve the county's ability to compile, analyze and understand the implications of Plan changes.

If this recommendation has not been (or is not being) addressed, do you concur with the recommendation? Why or why not?

As indicate above, the plan quantification portion of this recommendation is currently being addressed. However, the aspect of this recommendation that proposes a policy evaluation similar to that shown in the document entitled, State of the Plan (1996), is not consistent with the current Board of Supervisors approved approach, which set a schedule for reviewing each section of the Policy Plan over several years. This multi-year approach had resulted in a more thorough review of county policies by subject area than the mid-1990s approach which forced a review of all policies in what was previously known as the Policy Review Year.

EQAC has identified a weakness of the current approach, which is that it lacks an evaluation of the interrelationships among the Plan's underlying principles. The approach identified by EQAC under Land Use and Transportation recommendation #1b may be an aspect to add to the Plan Monitoring process (See response to Land Use and Transportation recommendation #1b).

What, if any, actions should be taken pursuant to EQAC's recommendation?

After each Plan Review cycle, the Plan change and Plan buildout information should be summarized and updated to provide current information regarding future development potential in the county. To improve the ability to quantify the Plan, the replacement of the Urban Development Information System with an integrated parcel lifecycle system should occur, as discussed under Land Use and Transportation recommendation #2.

Do the actions recommended above have any budget implications for FY 2007? If so, please explain.

Land Use and Transportation #1a

Continued

The actions described above are part of the current Plan Review process as approved by the Board of Supervisors and for continuation of this process there are no budget implications for FY 2007. However, the integrated parcel lifecycle system, as discussed under Land Use and Transportation recommendation #2, does have FY 2007 funding needs.

Do the actions recommended above have any longer-range fiscal implications? If so, please explain.

Staff recommended actions (as mentioned for the Plan Review process) do not have additional longer-range fiscal implications. However, the integrated parcel lifecycle system, as discussed under Land Use and Transportation recommendation #2, does have longer-range fiscal implications.

Response to 2005 EQAC Recommendation

Recommendation: Land Use and Transportation #1b (Land Use and Transportation Vision and Assessment)

(Pages 36-37 of the Annual Report on the Environment)

EQAC Recommendation:

The current Fairfax County Comprehensive Plan traces its roots back to the PLUS program that culminated in 1975 and the “Goals for Fairfax County” adopted in 1988. Numerous reviews and regular updates have occurred over the past 30 years, yet as stated in the current Plan: “Many of the key components of the 1975 Plan remain in the revised Plan, such as the emphasis on focusing growth in “Centers”; decreasing automobile dependency; and protecting environmentally sensitive areas and stable neighborhoods. What has changed are some of the means to achieve these ends.”

As the county approaches build out, EQAC recommends that the county:

- b. Assess the state of the county with respect to the PLUS Principles set forth in 1975 and the reality 30 years later. The PLUS Principles and planning approach were designed to achieve the following:
 - To increase local employment (in a period when Fairfax County was still primarily a bedroom suburb on the fringe of the urban core);
 - To decrease reliance on the private automobile by reducing the length of work trips and making mass transit facilities more easily accessible;
 - To reduce pressure for development in environmentally sensitive areas;
 - To preserve stable neighborhoods; and
 - To lower costs by more efficient provision of public services.

The Comprehensive Plan provides guidance to balance these competing goals. This assessment will help clarify the historical lessons learned and identify areas that have proven successful at a macro level across the county and where it needs to be strengthened for a future vision.

Lead agencies for this response: DPZ (Planning Division)

Coordinating agency(ies) for this response: DOT

Please identify a lead agency contact person: Sterling Wheeler

Land Use and Transportation #1b
Continued

Has this recommendation already been addressed, or is it in the process of being addressed? If so, please provide details.

An assessment with respect to the implementation of the PLUS Principles as set forth in 1975 is not currently being addressed. However, as part of the Plan Monitoring effort (as referred to under the response to recommendation #1a), Comprehensive Plan changes will be quantified for the period of 1995-2005 and general observations about how aspects of the Comprehensive Plan have been implemented will be included in this Plan change document. These observations are intended to focus on how Plan changes are influencing the county's development pattern. Basic aspects that will be included in this assessment are whether this ten year period of Plan changes has been focusing future growth in "centers" and whether the jobs/housing balance is being improved within the county.

If this recommendation has not been (or is not being) addressed, do you concur with the recommendation? Why or why not?

Staff supports EQAC's recommendation to evaluate the extent to which the county has addressed the PLUS Principles. We feel that EQAC's recommendation presents a possible framework for evaluating change in the county and could be a useful component of the Plan monitoring effort that we anticipate will begin in 2007, upon completion of the 2005/2006 South County Area Plans Review process.

Staff intends to bring EQAC's recommendation to the attention of the Planning Commission for its consideration as it works to set the direction for the next Plan monitoring effort.

What, if any, actions should be taken pursuant to EQAC's recommendation?

Staff should complete the Plan change (1995-2005) document as indicated under the response to recommendation #1a, which will evaluate development pattern and development potential issues associated with change to the Comprehensive Plan.

As noted above, staff proposes to present EQAC's recommendation to the Planning Commission for its consideration.

The creation of the integrated parcel lifecycle system, as discussed under Land Use and Transportation recommendation #2, will be an important resource for assessing Plan implementation.

Land Use and Transportation #1b
Continued

Do the actions recommended above have any budget implications for FY 2007? If so, please explain.

Staff is anticipating a Plan monitoring effort in 2007 and has prepared its FY 2007 budget request accordingly. However, detailed fiscal implications of the Plan monitoring process will not be known until the process has been better defined. Obviously, there will be no budget impact associated with communicating EQAC's recommendation to the Planning Commission.

The integrated parcel lifecycle system, as discussed under Land Use and Transportation recommendation #2, does have FY 2007 funding needs.

Do the actions recommended above have any longer-range fiscal implications? If so, please explain.

We do not anticipate that the Plan monitoring framework that may be developed as a result of EQAC's recommendation would have additional longer-range fiscal implications beyond what is already being anticipated for the Plan monitoring effort. However, the integrated parcel lifecycle system, as discussed under Land Use and Transportation recommendation #2, does have longer-range fiscal implications.

Response to 2005 EQAC Recommendation

Recommendation: Land Use and Transportation #2 (Land Use Tracking Capability)

(Page 37 of the Annual Report on the Environment)

EQAC Recommendation:

Over the past 3 years, EQAC has recommended that the county upgrade or replace the Urban Development Information System (UDIS). Working with Staff to better understand the situation, we are expanding the scope of this recommendation, and now urge the county to develop a capability to track the full lifecycle of each land parcel in the county. This capability should be leveraged by all county business functions. It will require the integration of multiple disparate databases that contain parcel information across county departments.

The ability to capture and share parcel information will improve the county's ability to:

- Evaluate planning issues and development options, account for Comprehensive Plan changes, and capture real time plan changes
- Facilitate public safety and plan for emergency preparedness
- Forecast future growth
- Understand and analyze land use at a finer resolution and provide information on mixed use
- Evaluate the environmental effect of each parcel and provide data necessary for modeling and understanding the cumulative effect of development

The integration of data across functional areas should take advantage of current technologies including GIS that allow information from disparate databases to be combined and analyzed by users from many different business functions. Consideration also should be given to making parcel "life-cycle" information available to citizens and businesses in electronic formats that would allow them to understand and use this information.

Lead agencies for this response: DSMHS

Coordinating agency(ies) for this response: DIT; DPZ (PD); DTA; DPWES; Fire & Rescue; FMD

Please identify a lead agency contact person: Anne Cahill

Has this recommendation already been addressed, or is it in the process of being addressed? If so, please provide details.

The recommendation is being addressed. Fairfax County has begun developing an integrated parcel lifecycle system that will allow parcel level data to be captured in a GIS based data warehouse. The goal of the new system is to create a cross-functional data store to better harness the value of land parcel information various county departments maintain and to make that information widely accessible through GIS technology.

Land Use and Transportation #2 Continued

Currently, critical information about land parcels is created and updated by a variety of county business processes. Much of this information is captured by information technology systems uniquely supporting these discrete business processes. The integrated parcel data warehouse will link data collected and maintained by a number of discrete county departments and functions such as:

- Department of Systems Management for Human Services – population estimates and forecasts; housing unit estimates and forecasts; household size and other underlying assumptions used for creating population, households and housing unit estimates and forecasts; daytime population; and estimated market value of housing;
- Department of Planning and Zoning – planned land use codes and interpretation; plan options and interpretation; information on parcels planned for mixed use or residential planned communities; rezoning applications and associated information; and zoning violation inspections;
- Department of Public Works and Environmental Services – sewershed codes; plans, waivers and associated information; building permits; and construction inspections;
- Department of Tax Administration – land parcel characteristics (i.e., land area, existing land use, zoning, easements, etc.); dwelling unit characteristics (i.e., year built, size, type, condition, additions, etc.); commercial structures characteristics (i.e., year built, size, use, parking spaces, etc.); real estate sales data; information on outbuildings and yard improvements; selected appraisal information; and etc.

This parcel data warehouse will be directly accessible by county staff in all departments, allowing them to use the information for analysis and modeling. Any information and/or geographies stored in GIS layers and tables will be attachable to the data residing in this integrated parcel data warehouse. The parcel data warehouse is designed to enable additional information to be integrated using GIS tools as new data sources are identified or developed. For example, although the impervious surface area and tree coverage information desired by EQAC (land use and transportation recommendation #3b) are not specifically part of the system design for the integrated parcel warehouse, these data reside in GIS layers and, therefore, can be used with the information in the parcel data warehouse.

Work will begin on the integrated parcel data warehouse during January 2006. It is anticipated that the data warehouse and the analysis capacity replacing the current functions of UDIS will be in place by the end of the calendar year. Additional capacities beyond those of the current UDIS, such as daytime population, will be developed during calendar year 2007.

If this recommendation has not been (or is not being) addressed, do you concur with the recommendation? Why or why not?

Not applicable.

What, if any, actions should be taken pursuant to EQAC's recommendation?

Land Use and Transportation #2 Continued

FY 2006 funding for UDIS replacement has been requested and identified. Some additional project resources and funding are required for FY 2007 and have been submitted to the budgeting process.

To meet this recommendation, DPZ will undertake an initiative to extract text based plan options in the Comprehensive Plan and convert them to digital format and codes which can be stored in a database (by parcel, where applicable; otherwise by area). Initial funding and resources to pursue this have also been identified. This activity for quantifying plan options may require additional funding in order to be completed in FY 2007.

Do the actions recommended above have any budget implications for FY 2007? If so, please explain.

It is anticipated that funding for the new system, data storage, programming, and contractor/integration services will be provided through the regular SubFund 104 process (to fund IT project initiatives).

If the County decides to capture all planimetric data, including impermeable surfaces, for all parcels (new process), there are several resource and cost implications that have not yet been budgeted:

- Cost to procure Countywide aerial photography and convert all planimetric data,
- Cost to specify and implement a new process and model that requires submission of electronic site plans by developers (new), and
- Cost of 1-2 new GIS positions to capture all planimetric data from all parcels (new business process with functions not performed today).

These requirements will be discussed in more detail in the response to the EQAC land use and transportation recommendation #3b with recommendations about impermeable surfaces.

Do the actions recommended above have any longer-range fiscal implications? If so, please explain.

Yes, resources will need to be expended to provide continuing system support and maintenance and to provide for the updating of the data elements. The current intention would be to absorb this work through existing staffing levels. However, DPZ has indicated that it may need additional staff resources to support their role in this new system.

Response to 2005 EQAC Recommendation

Recommendation: Land Use and Transportation #3a (Land Use and Transportation Planning)

(Page 37 of the Annual Report on the Environment)

EQAC Recommendation:

EQAC recommends that the Board of Supervisors and the county's Department of Planning and Zoning continue to consider land use and transportation together when revising the Comprehensive Plan.

Lead agencies for this response: DPZ (Planning Division)

Coordinating agency(ies) for this response: DOT

Please identify a lead agency contact person: Sterling Wheeler

Has this recommendation already been addressed, or is it in the process of being addressed? If so, please provide details.

The Department of Planning and Zoning does consider land use and transportation together when evaluating proposed Plan amendments. The Department of Transportation provides an evaluation of general transportation implications on each Plan amendment with proposed changes in land use and/or intensity of use. However, the scopes of transportation evaluations vary with the magnitude of proposed land use changes.

If this recommendation has not been (or is not being) addressed, do you concur with the recommendation? Why or why not?

This recommendation is being addressed and staff concurs with the need to evaluate the implications of proposed land use changes on transportation facilities during the review of proposed Plan amendments.

What, if any, actions should be taken pursuant to EQAC's recommendation?

No additional actions are needed to address this recommendation.

Do the actions recommended above have any budget implications for FY 2007? If so, please explain.

Land Use and Transportation #3a
Continued

In general there are no implications for FY 2007 for currently anticipated planning efforts. An exception would be if the Board of Supervisors authorizes a special study that needs an extensive transportation analysis. Under this circumstance, additional funds would be needed for the special study.

Do the actions recommended above have any longer-range fiscal implications? If so, please explain.

Actions as identified above have no long-range fiscal implications, except funding of analyses for special studies authorized by the Board of Supervisors.

Response to 2005 EQAC Recommendation

Recommendation: Land Use and Transportation Planning #3b

(Page 38 of the Annual Report on the Environment)

EQAC Recommendation:

EQAC recommends that the county identify and collect data on a parcel level that allows analysis of the parcel effect on environmental quality. Potential information includes impervious surface area, tree coverage, and existing and planned use and development intensity.

Lead Agency: DPWES (SWPD; LDS)

Coordinating Agency/ies: DIT, DPZ (PD), DTA, Systems Management for Human Services

Please identify a lead agency contact person: Laura Grape

Has this recommendation already been addressed, or is it in the process of being addressed? If so, please provide details.

This recommendation is partially being addressed. There is an ongoing effort to update the county's tree coverage data. However, funding is not currently available to support a comprehensive update of other county planimetric data (i.e., features of the built environment visible in aerial photography, which includes impervious surface area). Staff recognizes the need for updating this data as a critical step in the collection of accurate and current environmental information. Efforts to provide more recent and detailed tree coverage data are underway.

Tree canopy coverage data for calendar years 1990 and 2000 are currently used during the review of zoning cases and other urban forest management purposes. However, the canopy changes from 1990 and 2000 to date are large enough to lessen the confidence level of the existing data to the point of questionable usefulness.

To address this issue, staff is currently mapping the county's vegetation, into distinctive ecosystem-based communities, using the United States National Vegetation Classification System (USNVCS) as a standard. The final product will be a polygon-based GIS dataset that is fully compatible with other planimetric data and will delineate the extent and distribution of 40-plus indigenous plant communities down to the parcel level. It is anticipated that a countywide USNVCS dataset based on 2002/2003 satellite imagery will be completed in late 2007. Additionally, the acquisition of new leaf-on satellite imagery is scheduled for fall of 2007. Once the new imagery is analyzed, staff will begin updating the USNVCS dataset to reflect conditions found at the time of acquisition.

USNVCS mapping will allow approximate measurements of the total area and distribution of specific vegetation communities on a countywide basis, and should be valuable in the

Land Use and Transportation #3b

Continued

identification and conservation of unique and/or threatened plant communities and species on a parcel level.

The staff response to Land Use and Transportation recommendation #2 discussed efforts to establish an integrated parcel lifecycle system/geographic information system-based data warehouse through which a variety of parcel data can be accessed and integrated. This new system (Integrated Parcel Lifecycle System – IPLS) will serve to replace the Urban Development Information System (UDIS) and will provide a mechanism through which a broad range of analyses, including land use and environmental, may be conducted. However, the nature, extent, and rigor of these analyses will be dependent on the quality of the parcel-based data that is available to this system. The aforementioned staff response addressed efforts to improve digital information relating to the Comprehensive Plan; that response should be consulted in regard to EQAC's recommendation regarding existing and planned land use and development intensity. Updating impervious cover data is discussed below.

If this recommendation has not been (or is not being) addressed, do you concur with the recommendation? Why or why not?

Staff concurs that environmental analyses relating to land cover and impervious surface require accurate planimetric data. While significant updates of some of the planimetric data in the county's GIS have been pursued since initial data acquisition from 1997 aerial photography, there has been no systematic maintenance/updating of these data, and the need for a comprehensive updating of the county's planimetric data is recognized by staff. However, such efforts are not currently funded.

The state of Virginia will capture aerial photography at one- and two-foot resolutions for the entire state in calendar year 2006. Fairfax County will attain one-half foot resolution for its entirety. The higher resolution will increase the positional accuracy of features captured from the aerial imagery. The estimated cost to apply the photography in a comprehensive update of the planimetric layer is estimated to be \$1.4 million. This will update all of the planimetric features in the database and add new ones. This estimate includes the flying the county and processing the imagery along with funds for independent Quality Control. The base set of planimetric features is located at the end of this response – it is an extensive list and includes all of the planimetric features originally compiled in 1997. The new features include:

- Driveways
- Sidewalks – complete area
- Pools
- Patios
- Decks
- Sheds
- Tennis Courts
- 2-foot Contours (currently have 5-foot Contours)

Land Use and Transportation #3b

Continued

Once the data are digitized into planimetric form, determining the parcel effect on environmental quality can be easily evaluated using the up-to-date parcel layer that is maintained by the county's Geographic Information System (GIS) Branch.

The need for updated, accurate, and reliable planimetric data is clear based on a recent informal survey of the county's GIS users (see below). The results from 38 diverse users show there is a critical need for current and more detailed planimetric data for several reasons in addition to determining environmental impacts. One respondent stated, "You only need one phone call from an irate citizen to understand the value that this data holds for us." The purposes mentioned include, but are not limited to:

Results From an Informal Survey of County GIS Users

Department	Purposes
Board of Supervisors office	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Resident concerns response• Land use issues
Parks	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Development planning and management• Routing and mapping• Natural and cultural resource inventory
Planning and Zoning	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Evaluation• Enforcement• Court documentation• Property appraisal• Plan reviews and property acquisition
Public Safety (Fire and Rescue/Police)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Preplanning for Fire and Rescue• Emergency preparedness• Hazardous spill impacts• Crime mapping• Computer Aided Dispatch System
Public Works and Environmental Services	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Project design and evaluation• Stormwater runoff calculations• Citizen inquires or conflict resolution• Flood and dam breach zone emergency action plans• FIDO floodplain "alarm" tool• Solid waste services and charges for new properties
Transportation	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Pedestrian planning• VDOT permit applications

Land Use and Transportation #3b

Continued

What, if any, actions should be taken pursuant to EQAC's recommendation?

With respect to land use and Comprehensive Plan information, the actions outlined in the response to Land Use and Transportation recommendation #2 should be pursued, recognizing that the quantification of plan options may require additional funding in order to be completed in FY 2007.

Several county agencies are working to determine the information that needs to be included on the next planimetric update, the cost of digitizing the information, alternatives including frequency at which the layer is updated, estimated costs, and possible funding sources.

As far as the impervious layer, and based on the need of county GIS users, staff recommends that sidewalks and driveways also be digitized into planimetric data as standard features for more accurate representation and more reliable imperviousness calculations.

Do the actions recommended above have any budget implications for FY 2007? If so, please explain.

Yes, updating the county's planimetric data at the parcel scale will require significant resources. Staff has evaluated the estimated cost for updating the planimetric data for several scenarios, including:

Estimated costs to update the county's planimetric data

Scenario	Estimated Cost
<i>Update the entire county, once</i>	
Base Planimetric data (see list below):	\$1,150,000
Additional cost for capturing pools, patios, decks, sheds, and tennis courts:	\$290,000
<i>Total: \$1,440,000</i>	
<i>Update twenty-five (25) percent of the county, on a four-year cycle</i>	
Base Planimetric data (see list below):	Varies by quadrant. Average: \$322,000
Additional cost for capturing pools, patios, decks, sheds, and tennis courts:	Varies by quadrant. Average: \$82,000
<i>Total annual average: \$404,000</i>	
<i>Total over four years: \$1,616,000</i>	

Land Use and Transportation #3b

Continued

Do the actions recommended above have any longer-range fiscal implications? If so, please explain.

Yes, to maintain up-to-date planimetric data for the county will require significant funding and staff resources. Based on the results of the informal survey, staff recommends that this data be updated at least every two years, preferably annually. This is due to the rapid rate of development and change the county is experiencing.

It may be more practical to identify options for a systematic method to update the data on a more routine basis (e.g., updating data for one-fourth of the county each year or capturing the data in an ongoing manner from as-built surveys and other data sources) to keep associated costs low and data as current as possible.

Base set of planimetric features to be captured

Buildings	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Residential/Commercial/Industrial Buildings▪ Public Buildings
Hydrographic Features	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Lakes, Reservoirs▪ Dams▪ Ponds (Wet and Dry)▪ Rivers, Canals▪ Streams, Creeks▪ Swamps, Wetlands▪ Paved Ditch
Major Transportation	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Paved Roads▪ Unpaved Roads▪ Paved Alleys▪ Bridges, Overpasses
Minor Transportation	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Paved Parking Areas▪ Unpaved Parking Areas▪ Sidewalks▪ Raised Medians▪ Toll Booth Plaza▪ Driveways
Street Centerlines	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Street Centerlines▪ Intersection Nodes
Railroads	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Railroad Lines▪ Old Railroad Grades▪ Metrorail Lines
Recreation Features	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Community Pools
Airports	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Runways, Taxiways
Utility Features	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Transmission Lines▪ Transmission Towers
Contours	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Index Contours▪ Intermediate Contours▪ Intermediate Depression▪ Index Depression Contours
Dense Tree Index	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Dense Tree Intermediate▪ Dense Tree Depression-Index

Land Use and Transportation #3b
Continued

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Dense Tree Depression Intermed▪ Hidden Contours
Grids and Controls	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Horizontal Control Points▪ Vertical Control Points▪ Horizontal/Vertical Control▪ Analytical Control Points▪ NAD83/93 Coordinate Grid▪ Existing Cadastral Map Grid▪ NAD27 Coordinate Grid▪ Geo Grid Lat. and Long.
Spot Elevations	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Spot Elevations▪ Water Elevations
DTM Points	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ DTM Breakpoints▪ DTM Breaklines▪ DTM Structured Sampled Points

Response to 2005 EQAC Recommendation

Recommendation: Land Use and Transportation #3c (Land Use and Transportation Planning)

(Page 38 of the Annual Report on the Environment)

EQAC Recommendation:

EQAC recommends that the county develop models that allow analysis of the macro effects of land use and transportation decisions. These models should highlight congestion, air quality, commuting patterns, and health effects for use in future decisions. Such information is necessary as the county becomes more complex and densely developed. The county should also require Transportation Demand Management studies and plans for significant new development projects.

Lead agencies for this response: DPZ (Planning Division)

Coordinating agency(ies) for this response: DOT; Health

Please identify a lead agency contact person: Sterling Wheeler

Has this recommendation already been addressed, or is it in the process of being addressed? If so, please provide details.

Currently, the county's Department of Transportation is conducting a comprehensive review of the county's Transportation Plan. A key aspect of this review process has been to refine and make operational the countywide transportation model; the model has been utilized to conduct an extensive evaluation of alternative future land use and transportation networks on the macro level. The county's consultant and staff have evaluated model output and are currently formulating draft recommended changes to the Transportation Plan map. The model is also available for future countywide and sub-area transportation analyses as well as evaluating transportation impacts associated with significant proposed Plan amendments. However, additional funding or staffing resources will be required to complete such analyses.

The air quality component of the EQAC recommendation can be considered at a number of levels. As EQAC is aware, air quality planning at the regional level is conducted by the Metropolitan Washington Air Quality Committee, with the technical staff support and evaluations provided by the Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments. However, this effort is geared toward demonstrating attainment of Federal air quality requirements and not to evaluating land use and transportation concepts as they relate to air quality. Another effort being undertaken at COG is an evaluation of various regional growth scenarios for their transportation and air quality implications. County staff is participating in this study and tracking it closely for implications to land use planning in Fairfax County.

Land Use and Transportation #3c Continued

At the local level, the idea of incorporating air quality modeling analyses into land use decisions would not, in our view, be appropriate for site-specific development or Plan amendment proposals but may have merit for regional or sub-regional planning and transportation studies involving significant alternative scenarios. We feel that air quality considerations of land use decisions (except for those involving significant point sources) need to be considered in a regional context and that an exercise through which emissions of pollutants are estimated for a particular development proposal would be meaningless outside of this context. However, we do feel that it is appropriate to evaluate such proposals from the standpoint of measures that can be taken by developers to reduce vehicle trips and recommend that this be a continuing consideration in the zoning and Plan amendment processes.

A key initiative to reduce trips is transportation demand management, which as EQAC's recommendation indicates, is being utilized in significant new development projects. To highlight the importance of TDM, the draft Transportation Plan provides a new section of policies for this topic.

As an example of encouraging smart growth during the two years; staff worked with a citizen group and developer to formulate recommendations for transit-oriented design and densities adjacent to the Vienna Metro station. In this effort, extensive consideration and commitment occurred with regard to Metro access, pedestrian mobility, mixed use development, TDM, and technological enhancements intended to reduce reliance on the automobile and encourage pedestrian activity and Metro use.

If this recommendation has not been (or is not being) addressed, do you concur with the recommendation? Why or why not?

We do concur with the major emphasis of the recommendation, which is to develop models that allow analysis of macro effects of land use and transportation decisions. This aspect of the recommendation is currently being implemented as indicated above.

With respect to air quality analyses, we recommend that the idea of modeling emissions be considered in regional or sub-regional planning studies. We are not aware of how specific health effects can be modeled in this manner given the regional nature of ozone pollution.

With respect to TDM, we do concur that TDM should be utilized in significant new development projects to reduce trips and increase transit use.

What, if any, actions should be taken pursuant to EQAC's recommendation?

Continue the processes that are underway: 1) the evaluation and updating of the county's Transportation Plan, 2) continue to work with COG on addressing air quality issues, and 3) continue to improve the utilization of TDM.

Land Use and Transportation #3c
Continued

Do the actions recommended above have any budget implications for FY 2007? If so, please explain.

As noted above, funding was provided for transportation modeling to update the county's Transportation Plan. The update of the Transportation Plan should be completed by the end of FY 2006. Refining and using the transportation model to conduct studies beyond the Transportation Plan review would have budget implications for FY 2007. For example, the Board did provide funds for two sub-area studies in the FY 2005 and FY 2006 carry-over budgets for Tysons Corner and Laurel Hill. However, no funds for conducting additional studies using the model have been budgeted for FY 2007 or subsequent years.

Do the actions recommended above have any longer-range fiscal implications? If so, please explain.

In order to obtain full benefits from the transportation model for analyses and conducting sub-area studies, additional resources of funding and staff are needed. The cost for consultant support and additional technical staff proficient in transportation modeling for such ongoing efforts would be substantial.

Response to 2005 EQAC Recommendation

Recommendation: Land Use and Transportation #3d (Land Use and Transportation Planning)

(Page 38 of the Annual Report on the Environment)

EQAC Recommendation:

EQAC recommends that the county adopt new standards and ordinances to support Low Impact Development (LID) as part of the Public Facilities Manual. The county should also adopt ordinances, incentives, and proffers that encourage Green Building.

Lead agencies for this response: DPWES (LDS)

Coordinating agency(ies) for this response: DPZ (Planning Division)

Please identify a lead agency contact person: Michelle Brickner

Has this recommendation already been addressed, or is it in the process of being addressed? If so, please provide details.

This recommendation is in the process of being addressed. Please see Water Resources #4 for details on the status of efforts to amend the Public Facilities Manual to add LID.

Upon completion of the watershed master plans, there will be consideration and implementation of policy issues documented in the plans. Some of the policy issues address incentives and ordinance amendments to assist with the furtherance of LID and green building techniques within the County. DPWES is already implementing projects recommended in the Little Hunting Creek watershed plan, including the installation of LID practices. In addition, DPWES incorporates green building techniques in the design of County facilities.

Staff plans to develop Comprehensive Plan text, for consideration by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors, to support green building practices. Comprehensive Plan guidance would serve to support efforts to negotiate commitments to green building practices. The Board of Supervisors currently has the ability to accept proffers for use of LID and green building techniques and has exercised this ability in many cases.

If this recommendation has not been (or is not being) addressed, do you concur with the recommendation? Why or why not?

Staff generally supports green building concepts when balanced with economic considerations and feels that guidance supporting such concepts should be incorporated into the Comprehensive Plan. We are interested in EQAC's thoughts regarding ordinance revisions that may be needed/appropriate to support such concepts.

Land Use and Transportation #3d
Continued

What, if any, actions should be taken pursuant to EQAC's recommendation?

There should be consideration and, where appropriate, implementation of policy recommendations identified in the watershed master plans.

Do the actions recommended above have any budget implications for FY 2007? If so, please explain.

At this time there aren't any budget implications anticipated for FY 2007. Staff time will be needed to prepare an amendment to the Comprehensive Plan to support green building practices. No additional budget allocations, however, will be needed to support this effort.

Do the actions recommended above have any longer-range fiscal implications? If so, please explain.

At this time longer-range fiscal implications have not been identified.

Response to 2005 EQAC Recommendation

Recommendation: Land Use and Transportation #4a (Teleworking)

(Page 38 of the Annual Report on the Environment)

EQAC Recommendation:

EQAC commends the Board of Supervisors for actively supporting teleworking among the county staff. We are encouraged that the county is steadily increasing participation toward twenty percent. We urge that the Board continue to aggressively support the program.

Lead agencies for this response: County Executive's Office

Coordinating agency(ies) for this response: None

Please identify a lead agency contact person: Catherine Chianese

Has this recommendation already been addressed, or is it in the process of being addressed? If so, please provide details.

The Fairfax County Board of Supervisors and the County Executive have supported telework for the county workforce since 1996 and endorsed the Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments (COG) goal of 20% of the area workforce teleworking by 2005. Support for telework is one way that the county's leadership is addressing quality of life issues such as traffic congestion and air quality and business continuity issues.

If this recommendation has not been (or is not being) addressed, do you concur with the recommendation? Why or why not?

In October 2001, the county recommitted its telework efforts and launched the Telework Expansion Project. The intent of the project was to increase employee participation to reach a goal of 1,000 teleworkers by the close of 2005. Fairfax County government has approximately 5,000 positions that could be considered eligible for telework out of the county's total permanent workforce. One thousand teleworkers represent 20% of the positions considered eligible for telework.

This 20% goal was aggressive given the fact that the Fairfax County government is primarily a service oriented organization. While technology and the county's e-government initiatives have resulted in more citizens doing business with the county from remote locations, such as their homes, there are many county employees who are required everyday, to have face-to-face contact with the public.

Land Use and Transportation #4a Continued

We are pleased to report that the county has met the 20% by 2005 goal. By the close of 2005 almost every department has teleworkers, the number of teleworkers rose from 138 in December 2001 to over 1,000 at the end of 2005. Job categories are increasingly varied. Sample job titles for teleworkers include analysts of all types, administrative assistants, accountants, programmers, social workers, inspectors, engineers, public safety personnel, recreation and park specialists. Directors and assistant directors telework. The range of jobs widens as more employees discover there are at least eight hours of work they can do from another location – once a week or every other week.

During 2005, we were able to continue increasing the number of county teleworkers, to meet the regional goal, due to continued support from the Board of Supervisors and the County Executive. Promotional events held during the year such as “No Place Like Home” and “Tell-A-Buddy-To-Telework”, served to challenge employees and managers to consider telework.

What, if any, actions should be taken pursuant to EQAC’s recommendation?

The 20% goal set by COG was aggressive and achievable for Fairfax County Government.

For 2006, the county will continue to increase the number of teleworkers throughout the organization. In addition, emphasis will be placed on ensuring that personnel who provide essential services from a continuity of business operations perspective will be equipped to telework.

Do the actions recommended above have any budget implications for FY 2007? If so, please explain.

The Telework Expansion Program is funded within the department budgets of Information Technology, Transportation, and Human Resources.

Do the actions recommended above have any longer-range fiscal implications? If so, please explain.

A continued adequate level of funding for the Telework Expansion Project is anticipated.

Response to 2005 EQAC Recommendation

Recommendation: Land Use and Transportation #4b (Teleworking)

(Page 38 of the Annual Report on the Environment)

EQAC Recommendation:

EQAC commends the Board of Supervisors for maintaining its leadership role in improving the environment through greater use of teleworking by establishing an aggressive program directed at encouraging employers in the county to adopt or expand telework opportunities.

Lead agencies for this response: County Executive's Office

Coordinating agency(ies) for this response: None

Please identify a lead agency contact person: Catherine Chianese

Has this recommendation already been addressed, or is it in the process of being addressed? If so, please provide details.

The Fairfax County Employer Services Program, sponsored by the Department of Transportation, assists public and private sector businesses and employees in finding transportation solutions, including telework. Employer Services Specialists work on-site with businesses to discuss the full range of commuting alternatives. In 2005, they made 75 site visits within the county, held 15 Transportation Fairs for county employees, and worked with 16 businesses to develop Transportation Demand Management Programs.

If this recommendation has not been (or is not being) addressed, do you concur with the recommendation? Why or why not?

The on-site visits conducted by the county's Employer Services Program staff are effective in bringing attention to telework, offering expertise, and challenging major employers, public and private, to increase the number of teleworkers.

What, if any, actions should be taken pursuant to EQAC's recommendation?

Fairfax County government will continue to be an active participant and a role model in regional efforts to increase teleworking.

Do the actions recommended above have any budget implications for FY 2007? If so, please explain.

The Employer Services Program is funded within the department budget of the Fairfax Department of Transportation, with support from the MW Regional Council of Governments.

Do the actions recommended above have any longer-range fiscal implications? If so, please explain.

A continued adequate level of funding is anticipated.

Response to 2005 EQAC Recommendation

Recommendation: Land Use and Transportation #4c (Teleworking)

(Page 38 of the Annual Report on the Environment)

EQAC Recommendation:

EQAC recommends that the Board of Supervisors work with the Federal government to encourage an increase in teleworking. Further, we recommend the Board of Supervisors work closely with the Virginia Congressional Delegation to secure resources to establish teleworking sites within the county.

Lead agencies for this response: County Executive's Office
Coordinating agency(ies) for this response: None

Please identify a lead agency contact person: Catherine Chianese

Has this recommendation already been addressed, or is it in the process of being addressed? If so, please provide details.

The Fairfax County Board of Supervisors and staff regularly review and comment on funding proposals and legislative initiatives that advance telework in the region.

If this recommendation has not been (or is not being) addressed, do you concur with the recommendation? Why or why not?

Recommendation is being addressed

What, if any, actions should be taken pursuant to EQAC's recommendation?

Fairfax County will continue to monitor, evaluate, and propose funding and legislative initiatives that advance telework in the region

Do the actions recommended above have any budget implications for FY 2007? If so, please explain.

No budget impact anticipated

Do the actions recommended above have any longer-range fiscal implications? If so, please explain.

No budget impact anticipated.

Response to 2005 EQAC Recommendation

Recommendation: Land Use and Transportation #5a (Transportation)

(Page 38 of the Annual Report on the Environment)

EQAC Recommendation:

EQAC commends the Board of Supervisors for funding the Non-Motorized Transportation (Trails) Committee in FY 2005. EQAC recommends that the Board continue to provide regular funding to this Committee to implement those projects that have the greatest potential for increasing non-motorized methods of transportation within the county and reducing hazards to pedestrian traffic.

Lead agencies for this response: DOT and DPZ (Planning Division)

Coordinating agency(ies) for this response: None

Please identify a lead agency contact person: Chris Wells (DOT) and Sheng Leu (DPZ)

Has this recommendation already been addressed, or is it in the process of being addressed? If so, please provide details.

As established by charter adopted by the Board of Supervisors, the countywide Non-motorized Transportation (Trails) Committee has a framework in place for recommending an annual program for the funding and construction of trails and for establishing priorities for the construction of trails identified in the Comprehensive Plan. In December 2003, the Board endorsed the Non-motorized Transportation (Trails) Committee's Trails Plan priorities, which is a critical element of a capital plan for funding countywide trails as well as pedestrian facilities.

In 2003, the Board of Supervisors approved the composition of a Pedestrian Task Force. Part of the mission of the Pedestrian Task Force was to produce a 10-Year Capital Plan for pedestrian facilities. This Task Force completed work in 2005 and presented The 10-Year Pedestrian Plan to the Board of Supervisors in January 2006. The 10-Year Pedestrian Plan for pedestrian facilities will complement the activities and funding and priority recommendations developed by the Non-motorized Transportation (Trails) Committee and will assist the Board in implementing projects that have the greatest potential for increasing non-motorized methods of transportation within the county.

In the past the Board has provided funding by magisterial district for trail projects. Such funding has been limited due to budget reductions. On November 2, 2004, however, county voters approved a \$165 million General Obligation Bond Referendum as part of the Board's four-year Transportation Plan. Within the Board's four-year Transportation Plan, \$10.8 million was designated to fund countywide pedestrian improvements such as sidewalks and trails, and

Land Use and Transportation 5a Continued

improvements for bus stops and crosswalks, as well as pedestrian improvements for the Richmond Highway Initiative. In addition, the Board of Supervisors appropriated an additional \$2.0 million in general funds as part of the FY 2005 Revised Budget Plan for streetlight, drainage, sidewalk, trail and walkway projects. Of this general fund amount, \$990,000 was earmarked for sidewalks and trails construction. As there are still numerous missing links along the major commuting and recreational trails in the county, both the Non-motorized Transportation (Trails) Committee and the Pedestrian Task Force are currently developing a list of priority projects to be completed using both available and future funds to achieve a comprehensive interconnected trails system throughout the county.

If this recommendation has not been (or is not being) addressed, do you concur with the recommendation? Why or why not?

Staff supports the recommendation for continued funding for pedestrian improvements.

What, if any, actions should be taken pursuant to EQAC's recommendation?

The Non-motorized Transportation (Trails) Committee should continue its annual review of program priorities and recommendations for construction in coordination with the Departments of Planning and Zoning, Transportation, and Public Works and Environmental Services. As additional resources will be needed to achieve improved pedestrian access and to provide a comprehensive, interconnected trails system throughout the county, continued funding of pedestrian improvements as recommended in The 10-Year Pedestrian Plan should be provided.

Do the actions recommended above have any budget implications for FY 2007? If so, please explain.

Yes. Continued pedestrian access/trail improvements will require a continuing financial commitment on the part of the Board of Supervisors.

Do the actions recommended above have any longer-range fiscal implications? If so, please explain.

Yes. Continued pedestrian access/trail improvements will require a continuing financial commitment on the part of the Board of Supervisors. Based on knowledge of current conditions, it is reasonable to anticipate that the 10-year pedestrian capital plan and on-going review of trails priorities will identify a significant need for improvements and projects. Funding these improvements will have substantial costs.

Response to 2005 EQAC Recommendation

Recommendation: Land Use and Transportation #5b (Transportation)

(Page 39 of the Annual Report on the Environment)

EQAC Recommendation:

EQAC recommends that the county focus on improving transit utilization through a systematic plan that focus on multiple options within a community. For example, the Virginia Railway Express (VRE) Burke EZ Bus provides a convenient alternative to commuting to the Burke VRE station. This can be combined with pedestrian improvements, more connector bus options, and biking trails that together provide a diverse transportation plan.

Lead agencies for this response: DOT

Coordinating agency(ies) for this response: DPZ

Please identify a lead agency contact person: Leonard Wolfenstein

Has this recommendation already been addressed, or is it in the process of being addressed? If so, please provide details.

The Fairfax County Department of Transportation is focusing on a “multi-modal” approach to transportation planning, and this recommendation is being addressed on an ongoing basis. With respect to transit, the recommendation speaks to the need to consider all phases of a passenger’s trip, (e.g. frequent bus service is not attractive if there is no pedestrian access to the bus stop and the stop is not a safe or comfortable place to wait for the bus).

Over the last few years, the County Department of Transportation has structured itself in a way that leads to more systematic and multi-modal solutions to transportation challenges. The Board has directed the department to initiate a number of projects which are relevant to this recommendation. Examples are:

- Bus Stop Inventory Study – This study, completed in 2005, identified pedestrian access improvements needed at bus stops Countywide. The study also prioritized improvements for areas with the most need. Substantial funding will be needed to implement these improvements.

- **Richmond Highway Public Transportation Initiative** – This initiative is a multi-year, multi-faceted effort to improve the public transportation system in the Richmond Highway Corridor. Since bus passengers are pedestrians before and after their transit trip, this initiative establishes transit centers and improves bus stops, sidewalks and intersection safety for pedestrians in addition to improving bus service. While the pedestrian improvements are ongoing as funding becomes available, the South County Bus Plan, which increased the level of bus service in the corridor, was implemented in September 2004.
- **10-Year Pedestrian Plan** – A pedestrian task force was formed in 2004 to develop a safety awareness campaign and a 10 year pedestrian capital plan. County staff and citizens were on the task force which completed work in 2005. The 10-Year Pedestrian Plan was presented to the Board of Supervisors in January 2006. This Plan will complement the activities and funding and priority recommendations developed by the Trails and Sidewalks Committee (formerly the Countywide Non-motorized Transportation (Trails) Committee) and will assist the Board in implementing projects that have the greatest potential for increasing non-motorized methods of transportation within the County.
- **EZ Bus** – This innovative service was initiated in December 2003 to provide an alternate means of access to commuter rail as the parking at Burke Centre VRE is at capacity.

If this recommendation has not been (or is not being) addressed, do you concur with the recommendation? Why or why not?

This recommendation is being addressed to the degree that available manpower and funding resources allow.

What, if any, actions should be taken pursuant to EQAC's recommendation?

Transit service planning is done on an on-going basis; however it is done within financial constraints. As staffing resources and funding permit, it is worthwhile to expand efforts to improve transit utilization through multiple-option systematic approaches. In addition, there is a need for a Comprehensive County Transit Service Development Plan to improve transit service throughout the County.

Do the actions recommended above have any budget implications for FY 2006? If so, please explain.

There would be considerable fiscal impacts related to any expanded efforts to improve transit utilization through the development and implementation of systematic plans and initiatives, and even more with expanding service.

Land Use and Transportation 5b
Continued

Do the actions recommended above have any longer-range fiscal implications? If so, please explain.

Yes – Providing the capital improvements and the cost of transit service operating subsidies associated with this recommendation are substantial. Additional resources are needed for the development of a Comprehensive County Transit Service Development Plan.

Response to 2005 EQAC Recommendation

Recommendation: Air Quality #1

(Page 58 of the Annual Report on the Environment)

EQAC Recommendation:

County staff should continue to participate in the regional planning efforts through the Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments in identifying both quantifiable and qualifiable emission reduction measures and strategies to reduce air pollutants so that the Clean Air Act standards can be attained. We continue to recommend close coordination and communication between EQAC and the county on strategies and activities necessary to comply with the ozone and fine particle standard.

Lead agencies for this response: Health

Coordinating agency(ies) for this response: Environmental Coordinator; ECC Air Quality Subcommittee

Please identify a lead agency contact person: Barbara Hardy

Has this recommendation already been addressed, or is it in the process of being addressed? If so, please provide details.

This recommendation has been addressed.

Staff agrees with this recommendation and supports it by participating in regional air quality planning efforts. The Environmental Coordinator and Air Quality Program Manager attend the Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments' Air Quality Committee meetings and the Air Quality Program Manager is a member of the Technical Advisory Committee and the Control Measures Workgroup. These groups continue to work on strategies and control measures that can be implemented on a regional basis to achieve compliance with the ozone and fine particle standard. At this point a Master List of ozone control measures has been developed and a Priority List is being refined. The states of Maryland and Virginia and the District of Columbia are in the process of updating a baseline emissions inventory that will be used to determine measurable accomplishments. The same workgroup has been awaiting further Environmental Protection Agency guidance on how to proceed with plans to attain compliance with the fine particle standard. The group will start to develop control measures for this standard in 2006.

Staff agrees that close communication and coordination between EQAC and County staff is important and they plan to continue their effort to maintain this. Staff looks forward to working with EQAC and they welcome suggestions and recommendations on actions that can be taken on ozone and fine particle mitigation to achieve attainment of the standards. They also welcome involvement in all other air quality issues.

If this recommendation has not been (or is not being) addressed, do you concur with the recommendation? Why or why not?

Air Quality #1
Continued

What, if any, actions should be taken pursuant to EQAC's recommendation?

Do the actions recommended above have any budget implications for FY 2007? If so, please explain.

No.

Do the actions recommended above have any longer-range fiscal implications? If so, please explain.

No.

Response to 2005 EQAC Recommendation

Recommendation: Air Quality #2

(Page 58 of the Annual Report on the Environment)

EQAC Recommendation:

EQAC is pleased with the work of the county's Air Quality Subcommittee that included a variety of air quality management strategies as shown in the interim report and Clean Air Café menu that was presented to the Board of Supervisors' Environmental Committee (see the following: <http://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/opa/airquality/protectionstrategy.pdf> and <http://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/opa/airquality/cleanairmenu.pdf>). EQAC recommends that the Board adopt and implement all of the recommendations shown in the menu and report.

Lead agencies for this response: Health

Coordinating agency(ies) for this response: Environmental Coordinator; ECC Air Quality Subcommittee

Please identify a lead agency contact person: Barbara Hardy

Has this recommendation already been addressed, or is it in the process of being addressed? If so, please provide details.

This recommendation is in the process of being addressed.

The staff agrees with and fully supports EQAC's recommendation to implement the recommendations shown in the interim report and Clean Air Café menu. Staff has addressed some of the air quality management strategies in the plan and is continuing the process of implementing more recommendations as funding becomes available. Many of the recommendations that were identified as being "complimentary", meaning that they would require staff and other resources to implement, but they did not require additional budget allocations have been implemented. The remaining program recommendations and emission reduction measures will be funded and implemented in phases. The prioritization of the program recommendations and emission reduction measures will be based on the immediacy of the issue and the nature and cost-effectiveness of the emission reduction measure. Below is a summary of the costs associated with program implementation for those recommendations and clean air strategies that the BOS has funded to date.

<u>Recommendation</u>	<u>Funding Allocated (millions of dollars)</u>
<u>2004</u>	
Clean-fueled public transportation vehicles	1.630
Retrofit of diesel school buses	2.000
Retrofit of diesel trucks	0.234
Hybrid vehicle purchase	0.361 (57 vehicles)
No vapor fuel cans	0.005

Air Quality #2

Continued

Transfer station upgrade	0.050
Public outreach and education	0.015
Pedestrian Improvements	17.175
Green infrastructure	0.0180
Air quality monitoring equipment	0.0500
5% wind energy purchase for county facilities	0.105/year
Expand metrocheck program to all county employees	0.458/year (0.040 already allocated)

2005

Park Trail Mapping	0.0160
Air Quality Education Campaign	0.0150
Clean Air Partners Media Partner	0.0150
Landfill Gas Utilization Project	0.1500
Remote Household Hazardous Waste Collection Events	0.0600
5% wind energy purchase for county facilities	0.105/year

The staff and especially the Air Quality Subcommittee look forward to working with the Board of Supervisors and EQAC to further improve the air quality in Fairfax County and the region.

If this recommendation has not been (or is not being) addressed, do you concur with the recommendation? Why or why not?

What, if any, actions should be taken pursuant to EQAC's recommendation?

Staff needs to continue to request funding for recommendations through the budgetary process and any grant programs available.

Do the actions recommended above have any budget implications for FY 2007? If so, please explain.

Staff will seek funding to continue or to start implementation of more recommendations in the plan during the FY 2007 budget process.

Do the actions recommended above have any longer-range fiscal implications? If so, please explain.

As stated above, staff will continue to request funding sources until they are successful in implementing all of the recommendations in the air quality management plan.

Response to 2005 EQAC Recommendation

Recommendation: Air Quality #3

(Page 59 of the Annual Report on the Environment)

EQAC Recommendation:

EQAC is also pleased to see the air quality outreach effort that the county has started. By getting the word out to people we can obtain voluntary actions and efforts to help improve the region's air quality. Now if the county could only find a way to get more residents out of their cars and using mass transit or teleworking, then we would see a major change in the air quality emissions. The Air Quality Subcommittee should continue promoting clean air education programs and initiatives and find ways to expand their audience. We recommend that the Board of Supervisors continue to fund the air quality outreach program.

Lead agencies for this response: Health

Coordinating agency(ies) for this response: Environmental Coordinator; ECC Air Quality Subcommittee

Please identify a lead agency contact person: Barbara Hardy

Has this recommendation already been addressed, or is it in the process of being addressed? If so, please provide details.

Staff has started to address this recommendation and they will continue the work on this. The Office and Public Affairs and the Health Department worked together in 2005 to start an air quality outreach campaign. The EQAC Chairman was given a folder containing the outreach materials developed to date along with an enclosed report reviewing the actions taken in 2005 to get these materials and the action message they carry into the hands of county residents. The materials include brochures, fans, bookmarks, and magnets with the color coded Air Quality Index. The county also featured articles in News to Use, NewsLink, Courier, Homeowners Association newsletters, Weekly Agenda, the Washington Post Fairfax Extra, and a News Release. Materials were distributed at many locations including Board of Supervisor offices, the Government Center and South County Information Desks, Libraries, nature centers, historic sites, recreation centers, Senior Centers, Celebrate Fairfax!, county offices, Fairfax Connector sites along with other sites. Staff also participated in several outreach events held for county residents. Staff plan on continuing their efforts in 2006.

In addition, the county became a media sponsor with Clean Air Partners in 2005. This group is a public-private partnership chartered by the Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments to build and broaden awareness of how individuals contribute to air pollution and inform them about adverse effects of ground level ozone. Their primary focus is to promote easy and effective voluntary actions that individuals and employers can take to reduce the production of air pollution and individual's exposure to it.

Air Quality #3
Continued

Their campaign included a comprehensive radio advertising campaign and television public service announcement spots promoting awareness of air quality Code Red Days and air quality action steps. In addition they produced print materials to raise awareness and educate the public on voluntary actions. They also sponsored events and promotions targeting the 3.8 million people that commute to work everyday in the Washington-Baltimore region and actions they can take to help the regional air quality.

If this recommendation has not been (or is not being) addressed, do you concur with the recommendation? Why or why not?

What, if any, actions should be taken pursuant to EQAC's recommendation?

Do the actions recommended above have any budget implications for FY 2007? If so, please explain.

Staff will request funding through the budgetary process to be able to continue the air quality outreach campaign to encourage residents and businesses to take voluntary actions to reduce the level of air pollutants.

Do the actions recommended above have any longer-range fiscal implications? If so, please explain.

Annual funding is needed to maintain an air quality outreach campaign.

Response to 2005 EQAC Recommendation

Recommendation: Water Resources #1

(Page 112 of the Annual Report on the Environment)

EQAC Recommendation:

We commend the Board of Supervisors for its actions this spring (2005) authorizing one penny of the real estate tax to be dedicated to the stormwater management program. The amount for this coming fiscal year will be an additional \$17.9 million dollars. This is a significant contribution to implementing the recommendations outlined in the county's comprehensive watershed management plans, including retrofitting and rehabilitating existing and aging stormwater management facilities and infrastructure.

However, since this commitment will require reauthorization every year, EQAC continues to encourage the creation of a more stable funding source for watershed improvement.

Lead agencies for this response: DPWES (SWPD)

Coordinating agency(ies) for this response: None

Please identify a lead agency contact person: Laura Grape

Has this recommendation already been addressed, or is it in the process of being addressed? If so, please provide details.

Yes. This recommendation is being addressed via the annual budget process.

If this recommendation has not been (or is not being) addressed, do you concur with the recommendation? Why or why not?

This recommendation is currently being addressed.

What, if any, actions should be taken pursuant to EQAC's recommendation?

None.

Do the actions recommended above have any budget implications for FY 2007? If so, please explain.

The one cent of the real estate tax is currently in the county executive's proposed budget for FY 2007.

Water Resources #1
Continued

Do the actions recommended above have any longer-range fiscal implications? If so, please explain.

The continuation of the one cent of the real estate tax dedication will provide program stability, accommodate program growth, and provide continuity across fiscal years.

Response to 2005 EQAC Recommendation

Recommendation: Water Resources #2

(Page 112 of the Annual Report on the Environment)

EQAC Recommendation:

EQAC is pleased that Fairfax County is investigating and reexamining the current definitions and requirements pertaining to adequate outfall. However, EQAC cannot over emphasize the importance and need for increased monitoring of predevelopment stormwater management controls and taking enforcement action to ensure inadequate controls are corrected prior to construction and if necessary during construction. It is also important that the county hire the appropriate number of staff to handle the estimated inspection workload. We are also pleased that staff is in the process of creating regulations that will enforce the PFM requirements for detention during the development phase. This is another enforcement tool that will protect streams during the construction phase. We recommend that the Board of Supervisors approve both of these initiatives.

Lead agencies for this response: DPWES (Land Development Services)

Coordinating agency(ies) for this response: DPWES (Stormwater Planning Division)

Please identify a lead agency contact person: Michelle Brickner

Has this recommendation already been addressed, or is it in the process of being addressed? If so, please provide details.

This recommendation is being addressed. In a Letter to Industry dated October 3, 2005, professionals who prepare plans for review and approval were notified of a new requirement to analyze and address adequacy of outfalls during the construction phase in addition to the requirements already in place for the developed site. As detailed in the letter, plans proposing land disturbing activity must include an analysis of the adequacy of all outfalls from the site based on the site being cleared and the installation of the Phase 1 erosion and sediment controls. During the construction of the site, the imperviousness and drainage patterns may be very different than those of the developed site. An analysis of the adequacy of the outfalls of the site at this phase will decrease adverse impacts to outfalls during construction. Temporary or permanent detention will be required to be installed with the Phase 1 controls if needed to achieve an adequate outfall.

A committee of professionals from the public and private sector developed recommendations for amendments to the PFM's provisions for adequate drainage. An overview of the proposed amendments was presented to EQAC and the amendments were coordinated with the Virginia Department of Conservation and Recreation. The amendments provide greater clarity with respect to the extent of downstream review, and in many cases will require design professionals to analyze much farther downstream. In addition, the amendments add options for proving no adverse impact and a proportional improvement in instances where an outfall is inadequate. The amendments were adopted by the Board of Supervisors on February 6, 2006 and are now effective. LDS will be providing training on the new provisions to County staff and private sector professionals.

Water Resources #2
Continued

The Board of Supervisors approved additional site review and inspection positions for Land Development Services in the FY 06 budget. These additional positions will assist in identifying issues early in the plan review and inspection phase of construction.

If this recommendation has not been (or is not being) addressed, do you concur with the recommendation? Why or why not?

What, if any, actions should be taken pursuant to EQAC's recommendation?

No further action is required at this time.

Do the actions recommended above have any budget implications for FY 2007? If so, please explain.

We don't anticipate any budget implications.

Do the actions recommended above have any longer-range fiscal implications? If so, please explain.

At this time, we don't anticipate any longer-range fiscal implications.

Response to 2005 EQAC Recommendation

Recommendation: Water Resources #3

(Page 112 of the Annual Report on the Environment)

EQAC Recommendation:

EQAC strongly recommends that Fairfax County (the Board of Supervisors, the Planning Commission, the Board of Zoning Appeals, the Fairfax County Park Authority and various county agencies) continue to coordinate efforts and develop a protocol for assessing the impacts and cumulative effects of land use considerations and decisions on the county's water resources. EQAC urges them to use and disseminate this information to protect the county's watersheds. EQAC commends the Board for adopting Residential Development Criteria that include supporting the provision of adequate drainage outfalls and innovative water quality measures.

Lead agencies for this response: DPWES (Stormwater Planning Division)

Coordinating agency(ies) for this response: DPWES (LDS); DPZ (PD); NVSWCD

Please identify a lead agency contact person: Laura Grape

Has this recommendation already been addressed, or is it in the process of being addressed? If so, please provide details.

Efforts that were enumerated in the staff response to a similar recommendation last year continue. Strengthened stormwater management submission requirements, as well as a related restriction on stormwater management facility expansion, are now effective. Details regarding these new requirements were provided in last year's response and are repeated below for the benefit of the reader. The additional stormwater management information that is now provided during the zoning process has enhanced the county's ability to evaluate stormwater management needs and implications during this process. As noted below, both the Stormwater Planning Division and Land Development Services section of the Department of Public Works and Environmental Services actively participate in the zoning process.

The county is continuing its multi-year effort to develop watershed management plans for all thirty of the County's watersheds. By the end of 2005, approximately 60 percent of the County (11 watersheds) had Watershed Management Plans completed or in development. Both the Little Hunting Creek and Popes Head Creek watershed plans have been adopted by the Board of Supervisors. Four other watershed plans are currently being developed, with several scheduled to be completed in calendar year 2006. The overall watershed planning program was re-evaluated in 2005 to identify challenges and make appropriate changes to increase the efficiency of plan development.

Water Resources #3 Continued

While planning and zoning designations are not being reconsidered through this effort, the watershed management planning process can highlight specific areas where land use changes will be of particular concern, and it is anticipated that broad policy considerations with countywide implications (which may include land use issues) will be considered upon the completion of the first set of watershed management plans.

The County has examined its regional pond policy and is now utilizing an interim matrix that can be applied to determine optimal stormwater management solutions within specific watersheds where a watershed plan has not been completed. Each watershed plan will examine alternative stormwater management techniques to the planned regional ponds. This analysis will consider upstream culvert BMP retrofit opportunities, low impact development practices within designated areas/zones, specific bioretention facilities, existing onsite SWM retrofits, possible new multi-site SWM facilities in desirable locations, etc. Upon the completion of the countywide watershed planning effort, the regional pond matrix will no longer be necessary.

As noted in last year's response, on March 29, 2004, the Board of Supervisors adopted an amendment to the Zoning Ordinance that strengthened the stormwater management submission requirements for zoning applications (rezonings, special exceptions, special permits, and related applications). This amendment became effective on July 1, 2004. Specifically, all plats or development plans associated with such applications must include the location, estimated size of facility footprint in area, and type of all stormwater management facilities, including the full extent of side slopes, embankments, spillways, dams, and water surface elevations of design storms, if applicable. In addition, all applications are required to include a preliminary stormwater management plan that contains information about the adequacy of downstream drainage, including the sufficiency of capacity of any streams, drainageways, and/or storm drainage pipes into which stormwater runoff from the site will be conveyed. Any such application involving a land disturbance of 2,500 square feet or more must include additional graphic and narrative information regarding the proposed stormwater management system for the development, including information regarding existing outfall conditions for each watercourse receiving drainage from the site and a description of how adequate outfall requirements of the Public Facilities Manual will be satisfied. A checklist entitled "Minimum Stormwater Management Information for Rezoning, Special Exception, Special Permit and Development Plan Applications" was circulated to the development industry along with a request for this checklist to be incorporated into their applications. The latest version of this checklist is available on-line at: http://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/dpwes/publications/lti/06_06.htm

The aforementioned Zoning Ordinance Amendment also significantly restricted the extent to which the limits of clearing and grading for stormwater management facilities can be expanded (such expansions are not permissible where they will result in a reduction of non-stormwater management open space, tree save, and/or landscaping area on the property in question). The desired effect of this restriction (along with the strengthened submission requirements) was to ensure that applicants will have done a sufficient amount of preliminary analysis of stormwater management needs and solutions and that the stormwater management systems that are presented on development plans will be viable and effective in protecting downstream resources. Staff's preliminary experiences with the strengthened submission requirements have been positive; we feel that the additional information we receive has been effective in better identifying stormwater

Water Resources #3

Continued

management issues up-front, thereby ensuring the appropriate consideration of these issues in the conceptual design process.

Concurrent with the adoption of the aforementioned Zoning Ordinance Amendment, it was recognized by staff that there was a need for more technical staff analysis regarding stormwater management issues during the zoning process. DPWES has committed to providing a preliminary analysis of the sizing of the proposed stormwater management facility and the adequacy of outfall submitted by applicants at the zoning stage. As a result of this commitment, DPWES is reviewing each rezoning, special exception and special permit application and is providing written comments on the stormwater management facility design and other drainage issues for incorporation into the staff analysis of the application. The level of review by DPWES that is occurring during the zoning process is being done through the use of an existing computer algorithm to verify the size of the facility is adequate for the site, and through the review of existing drainage conditions in the vicinity of the proposal. Although the review of the proposed stormwater management and outfall adequacy that is occurring as a result of this amendment at the zoning stage is not be as extensive as the review that occurs at the time of site plan/subdivision plat review, this process is increasing staff's ability to determine whether the proposed stormwater management facility footprint depicted on a development plan or plat submitted at the zoning review stage is adequate to meet the detention, BMP and adequate outfall requirements. It is also anticipated that the active involvement of DPWES staff during the zoning process will facilitate increased applications of techniques generally associated with low impact development concepts and will ensure that opportunities for implementation of watershed management planning recommendations during the zoning process will, where appropriate, be identified and pursued.

Additionally, in order to further facilitate this effort, DPWES has developed a prestaffing rezoning application review checklist, in which even before the plan is staffed in DPZ, a consistent list of comments are assembled for discussion at DPZ staffing meetings. Topics such as pond size, adequate outfall, SWM, and LID generally are addressed.

The Northern Virginia Soil and Water Conservation District (NVSWCD) also makes recommendations for protecting streams at the rezoning stage. Following a visit to each site proposed for a rezoning, NVSWCD staff provides DPZ with a comprehensive environmental evaluation for proposed land use change. The review takes into consideration the properties of soils, slopes, erosion potential, existing natural resources, and drainage. Particular attention is given to streams, stormwater management, and impacts that may result both on and off site. Recommendations are made, as appropriate, for better site design techniques, low impact development practices, and stormwater management measures that will lessen the impact. NVSWCD also works directly with developers to advise ways to develop sites with less adverse impact on streams and other natural resources.

With respect to low impact development (LID) techniques, the County is in the first phase of incorporating LID techniques into the Public Facilities Manual (PFM)--twenty-five practices with brief descriptions, illustrations, and functions were presented to internal and external stakeholders; representatives of EQAC were involved in this process. As a result of the input received from the stakeholders, six practices have been selected to be developed and put into the

Water Resources #3 Continued

PFM as an approved practice within Fairfax County. The text of the proposed amendments to add the six practices is currently being finalized. It is anticipated that the amendments will be brought to the Board of Supervisors for authorization to advertise the amendments by the end of the summer of 2006.

The Northern Virginia Soil and Water Conservation District and Fairfax County have partnered in the design and/or implementation of numerous high-profile LID demonstration projects. Examples include:

Demonstration Project	LID Techniques	Status
Lorton Workhouse Arts Center	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Bioretention▪ Porous Pavers▪ Underground Detention▪ Infiltration Swales	In construction
Yorktowne Square Condominiums, Merrifield	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Rain Garden▪ Green Roof	Complete
Demonstrating Innovation: A Stormwater Retrofit at the Providence Supervisors Office	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Rain Garden▪ Permeable Pavers▪ Green Roof▪ Underground Detention	Complete – monitoring of runoff quality to be completed spring 2006.
Tinner Hill Heritage Site, Falls Church	Numerous LID techniques	Conceptual design complete

Each of these projects provides excellent educational opportunities through displays, brochures, tours, and interpretive signage.

Several projects utilizing LID techniques were recommended in the Little Hunting Creek Watershed Plan and are currently being implemented in the Mount Vernon area.

The Park Authority is exploring how to better incorporate LID practices in County parks as part of the Park Authority Natural Resource Management Plan approved by the Park Authority Board in January, 2004. In the first year implementation (FY 2005), the Park Authority researched the options available and their costs and benefits. In addition, the Park Authority will be implementing an LID demonstration project funded by the Board of Supervisors with carryover funds dedicated to implementation of the Board's Environmental Agenda.

If this recommendation has not been (or is not being) addressed, do you concur with the recommendation? Why or why not?

Staff concurs with EQAC's recommendation.

Water Resources #3

Continued

What, if any, actions should be taken pursuant to EQAC's recommendation?

The Department of Planning and Zoning and the Department of Public Works and Environmental Services should coordinate on the development of a process through which stormwater management implications of Comprehensive Plan amendment proposals can be assessed by DPWES.

After some experience has been gained in the review of development proposals under the strengthened stormwater management submission requirements, DPZ and DPWES should coordinate to discuss the strengths and weaknesses of the new requirements and their implementation and to identify improvements in the interagency coordination process that may be needed.

LID feasibility studies and efforts to install demonstration projects should continue. Monitoring plans should be implemented in order to assess the effectiveness of demonstration projects.

Do the actions recommended above have any budget implications for FY 2007? If so, please explain.

The watershed and stormwater management program will be funded through the one cent on the real estate tax dedication. The one cent of the real estate tax is currently in the county executive's proposed budget.

Do the actions recommended above have any longer-range fiscal implications? If so, please explain.

The continued real estate tax dedication will provide stability, accommodate growth, and provide continuity across fiscal years.

Response to 2005 EQAC Recommendation

Recommendation: Water Resources #4

(Page 112 of the Annual Report on the Environment)

EQAC Recommendation:

EQAC commends county staff for investigating and evaluating LID and innovative BMP techniques for inclusion in the PFM. EQAC recommends that the county continue to encourage innovative practices that incorporate bioretention and recharge to aquatic systems. EQAC recommends that appropriate DPWES, DPZ, and LDS staff members are educated on reviewing designs and inspecting projects that incorporate these new techniques. Additionally, EQAC recommends that staff coordinate efforts on developing a process through which these plans are assessed in a timely manner.

Lead agencies for this response: DPWES (Land Development Services)

Coordinating agency(ies) for this response: DPWES (SWPD); DPZ (PD)

Please identify a lead agency contact person: Michelle Brickner

Has this recommendation already been addressed, or is it in the process of being addressed? If so, please provide details.

This recommendation is in the process of being addressed. In 2005, as part of a larger effort to integrate LID techniques and practices into the County's stormwater management program, 6 LID practices were identified by DPWES in coordination with a stakeholders' group for incorporation into the Public Facilities Manual (PFM). The 6 practices are: bioretention basins and filters (rain gardens), water quality (vegetated) swales, tree box filters, vegetated roofs (green roofs), permeable pavers, and reforestation. Authorization by the Board of Supervisors to advertise the proposed amendments is projected to occur by the end of the summer of 2006. DPWES will provide appropriate training for review and inspection staff as part of implementation of the PFM amendments after adoption.

Several projects, highlighting the use of LID techniques and other innovative stormwater management practices, are currently in design, under development, or have been completed on county-owned property. LID practices increasingly are being incorporated into development plans. Proposals to implement LID practices are evaluated by DPWES and DPZ staffs during the zoning process and are pursued where appropriate. DPWES is also working with the Northern Virginia Regional Commission and the Engineers and Surveyors Institute on preparation of a regional design manual for LID techniques and practices.

Water Resources #4

Continued

If this recommendation has not been (or is not being) addressed, do you concur with the recommendation? Why or why not?

What, if any, actions should be taken pursuant to EQAC's recommendation?

Complete the activities described above.

Do the actions recommended above have any budget implications for FY 2007? If so, please explain.

No.

Do the actions recommended above have any longer-range fiscal implications? If so, please explain.

No

Response to 2005 EQAC Recommendation

Recommendation: Water Resources #5

(Page 113 of the Annual Report on the Environment)

EQAC Recommendation:

EQAC continues to support the full funding and implementation of the comprehensive countywide watershed management program. EQAC strongly endorses the ongoing work of county staff with their watershed planning and public outreach efforts and comprehensive stream monitoring program.

EQAC continues to support:

- a) Continued assessments of watersheds, including identification of point and nonpoint sources, levels of erosion, riparian buffer coverage, percentage of impervious surface, and vegetative cover;
- b) Equal importance should be devoted to environmental protection, restoration, and monitoring as compared to infrastructure improvement and maintenance;
- c) Maintenance and inspection of county BMPs at the highest level;
- d) Development of a stream protection and restoration program that has adequate sustainable funding;
- e) The coordination of all relevant water quality and stream data and data analysis from all sources including the Stream Protection Strategy Baseline Study, Physical Stream Assessment Study, Comprehensive Stream Monitoring Program, and watershed planning program; and
- f) Granting a minimum number of waivers and reducing the granting authority to a single department so that all waivers must be reviewed and either accepted or denied by the stormwater management program responsible for watershed planning (i.e., the Stormwater Planning Division of DPWES).

Lead agencies for this response: DPWES (SWPD & MSMD)

Coordinating agency(ies) for this response: DPWES (LDS); FCPA

Please identify a lead agency contact person: Laura Grape

Has this recommendation already been addressed, or is it in the process of being addressed? If so, please provide details.

- a) *Continued assessments of watersheds, including identification of point and nonpoint sources, levels of erosion, riparian buffer coverage, percentage of impervious surface, and vegetative cover;*

A portion of the funds dedicated specifically to the stormwater management program in FY06 as well as pro rata share funds, have been encumbered for the completion of current planning efforts and will be used to initiate the next three plans. The watershed planning effort has been

Water Resources #5

Continued

refined to make the evaluation of watershed conditions, including the identification of point and nonpoint pollution sources and impervious cover percentage, more efficient. Erosion points, riparian buffer coverage, and overall vegetative coverage will also continue to be assessed and refined through the planning processes.

b) Equal importance should be devoted to environmental protection, restoration, and monitoring as compared to infrastructure improvement and maintenance;

Currently the greatest weight for prioritizing the projects identified in the watershed plans is given to an existing matrix, adopted by the Board of Supervisors. Under this matrix, projects mandated by state or federal regulations as well as those which alleviate structural damage by flood waters or severe erosion, and VPDES/MS4 permitted stormwater quality improvement projects are given priority over those that eliminate severe to minor streambank and channel erosion and yard and road flooding. However, public support as well as the project's effectiveness and location also contribute to the final prioritization listing. It should be noted that infrastructure failure would have serious environmental consequences, such as transport of a large amount of sediment downstream and flooding and erosion upstream of a blockage as the water seeks an alternate route.

Another ongoing effort to protect water quality in Fairfax County is through the Northern Virginia Soil and Water Conservation District. The district works with horse-keeping operations to develop soil and water conservation plans. These plans provide a foundation for maintaining healthy pastures, controlling erosion, providing riparian buffers, and properly managing manure and other associated nutrients.

c) Maintenance and inspection of county BMPs at the highest level;

The acquisition of additional funds for the county's stormwater management programs allowed for an increased level of service in the inspection and maintenance of the county's stormwater management facilities and storm drainage network.

Additional resources allow for improved inspection and maintenance methods. Maintenance priority is given to stormwater management facilities which require repairs related to human safety and safety of the facilities, as well as water quality and quantity improvements. Inspections will continue to occur on a five-year rotational basis. In addition, inspections also include non-pond BMP's (i.e. rain gardens & public infiltration trenches).

Physical assessment of the storm drainage conveyance network has begun on a 20 to 30 year cycle. This effort will identify critical conveyance system work to ensure safety and protect the downstream environment.

Through increased inspections, the stormwater program has eliminated sanitary sewer cross-connections and decreased sediment loads, benefiting downstream receiving waterbodies.

Other examples of increased level of service include:

- Initiating an education/outreach program targeted at inspections staff, homeowners associations, and private stormwater pond owners. A communications specialist position

Water Resources #5

Continued

was secured, in December 2005, to assist with the implementation of this program. The program includes:

- Training workshops
- Community meetings or “summits”
- Educational materials
- Customer surveys
- Web site updates
- Dredging four existing wet pond facilities to bring them into compliance with PFM standards for sediment removal efficiencies.
- Increasing support for the implementation of new stormwater management technologies (Low Impact Development techniques) which require different levels of inspection and maintenance than typical stormwater controls.
- Gathering data on privately-owned state-regulated stormwater detention facilities for the production of Emergency Action Plans (EAPs).
- Coordinating with the Fairfax County Health Department to conduct ongoing mosquito populations monitoring around wet ponds, dry ponds, and retrofitted facilities.
- Completing a GIS-based digital stormwater conveyance network, including 1800 miles of pipe systems and 800 miles of natural channels.

Last Half of FY 2006 (Projected)	
Goal: % of manmade stormwater conveyance system assessed (20 year cycle)	5% (90 miles)
Actual length of manmade stormwater system assessed	50 miles (Projected)
Goal: % of manmade stormwater conveyance system rehabilitated to serviceable condition	5% (90 miles)
Actual length of manmade stormwater conveyance system rehabilitated to serviceable condition	50 miles (Projected)

d) Development of a stream protection and restoration program that has adequate sustainable funding;

The county's efforts to protect and restore its stream valleys are funded through the dedicated penny on the Real Estate Tax; pro rata share collections; developer contributions; grants; and partnerships with the Army Corps of Engineers, Fairfax County Park Authority, and Northern Virginia Soil and Water Conservation District.

e) The coordination of all relevant water quality and stream data and data analysis from all sources including the Stream Protection Strategy Baseline Study, Physical Stream Assessment Study, Comprehensive Stream Monitoring Program, and watershed planning program; and

Ongoing evaluations of stream biological, chemical, and physical attributes will continue through the county's Stream Quality Assessment Program. The *2005 Annual Report on Fairfax County's Streams* highlights the initial integration of various data sources into one comprehensive document, including reliable trend data from both the Northern Virginia Soil and Water Conservation District and the Audubon Naturalist Society's Volunteer Stream Monitoring

Water Resources #5

Continued

Programs. This long-term monitoring program supports the Board of Supervisor's 20-Year Vision for Environmental Excellence and meets the requirements set forth in local, state, and federal regulations. Over time the substantial dataset developed through this program, will be essential in determining the overall rate of change or trends in the conditions of Fairfax County's streams and provide a basis for prioritizing future implementation measures to restore watersheds.

The report is available through the county's Web site:

www.fairfaxcounty.gov/dpwes/stormwater/resources.htm

- f) *Granting a minimum number of waivers and reducing the granting authority to a single department so that all waivers must be reviewed and either accepted or denied by the stormwater management program responsible for watershed planning (i.e., the Stormwater Planning Division of DPWES).*

The granting authority of waivers is under one department in Fairfax County, the Department of Public Works and Environmental Services. Stormwater waivers are reviewed by the county's Stormwater Planning Division to provide recommendations on innovative practices to reduce runoff from sites and maintain aspects of water quality defined by several existing studies (Stream Protection Strategy Baseline Study, Stream Physical Assessment, soil surveys, etc). The final approval authority is under Land Development Services.

If this recommendation has not been (or is not being) addressed, do you concur with the recommendation? Why or why not?

What, if any, actions should be taken pursuant to EQAC's recommendation?

Continue the watershed planning effort, the adoption of new stormwater standards for LID and other innovative techniques, and the coordination with volunteer monitoring programs to integrate and analyze their data for water quality trends.

Do the actions recommended above have any budget implications for FY 2007? If so, please explain.

The watershed and stormwater management program will be funded through the one cent on the real estate tax dedication. The one cent of the real estate tax is currently in the county executive's proposed budget.

Do the actions recommended above have any longer-range fiscal implications? If so, please explain.

The continued real estate tax dedication will provide program stability, accommodate program growth, and provide continuity across fiscal years.

Response to 2005 EQAC Recommendation

Recommendation: Water Resources #6

(Page 113 of the Annual Report on the Environment)

EQAC Recommendation:

EQAC continues to recommend posting of health warnings for county streams with high fecal coliform and *E. coli* bacteria levels until an investigation is conducted and the source of the contamination is identified and remediated. EQAC recommends that these investigations are carried out and remediation plans be implemented whenever there are actual threats to public health. Because county streams continue to have high bacteria coliform counts, EQAC recommends developing a public information campaign and sign posting program that contains the following language from the 1999 Health Department report: *“The use of streams for contact recreational purposes, such as swimming, wading, etc. which could cause the ingestion of stream water or possible contamination of an open wound by stream water, should be avoided.”*

Lead agencies for this response: DPWES (SWPD)

Coordinating agency(ies) for this response: HEALTH

Please identify a lead agency contact person: Danielle Wynne

Has this recommendation already been addressed, or is it in the process of being addressed? If so, please provide details.

As recommended by the EPA, Fairfax County completed its transition in 2005 to using *E. coli* as our indicator of possible fecal contamination versus using fecal coliform. The basis behind this change stems from the 1986 EPA findings that *E. coli* exhibits a stronger correlation to swimming borne illnesses for humans than fecal coliform. Thus by changing indicators, we are able to make better recommendations regarding the safety of our water for recreational uses. In addition to testing for *E. coli* levels, we continue to test for total phosphorous, nitrate, and nitrogen levels.

Additionally, in 2005 the Health Department updated its procedure to determine *E. coli* levels from the Modified *E. coli* method which was a membrane filter technique, to the Colilert test by IDEXX. This new testing method increases the precision of the results and reduces the amount of human based error.

The bacteriological monitoring program is under review to identify opportunities to improve the efficiency and cost-effectiveness of the program in addition to create tools for educational purposes.

Within the required monitoring for the VPDES program, staff identified bacteriological monitoring locations that were consistently high as locations for Dry Weather Screening. This is

Water Resources #6

Continued

the first step in creating a versatile program that will answer specific questions concerning the levels of *E. coli* found in our waterways and begin to identify hot spot sources, not found through static monitoring.

The county is also working with two Thomas Jefferson High School (TJHSST) seniors to identify potential sources in the Long Branch tributary of Accotink Creek, using Optical Brightener Monitoring techniques. Staff will use the results of the USGS study and the TJHSST pilot study to determine the effectiveness and practicality of using OBM as a supplement to grab samples.

Though staff concurs with the EQAC recommendation on a public information campaign, we do not support the proposal for a sign campaign for several reasons. One reason in particular is the sometimes sporadic results where a stream may be above the DEQ maximum allowances during one sampling regime and below it the next. This would require staff to constantly put up and take down signs. Additional maintenance and aesthetic concerns also make signage an impractical and cost-prohibitive awareness tool.

Furthermore, in 2005 staff worked with the county's public school system and other partners on a number of new exciting education and outreach programs to increase the public's understanding on the state of our waterways and how common practices can affect the quality of our water. These programs include:

Program	Description
Sewer Science	Sewer Science is a curriculum designed to educate high school science students on the multi-step decontamination process that occurs to wastewater. Fairfax County has integrated a stormwater component in which a trained mentor from the Stormwater Planning Division will go to each school to discuss issues that staff are facing which includes the bacteriological monitoring program, results, and recommendations.
BWET program for middle school teachers	Staff is working with the county's middle school science curriculum specialist, to provide support in introducing all middle school teachers to the Bay Watershed Education Training (BWET) program. This support includes a presentation of our bacteriological program and its results.

These programs have proved to be an effective opportunity to communicate the Health Department's Water Quality Statement for the Recreational Use of County Streams directly to students and teachers as well as information about the county's bacteriological monitoring program, recent results, Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDLs), and ways residents can help reduce the amount of bacteria, nitrogen, and phosphorus from their property.

If this recommendation has not been (or is not being) addressed, do you concur with the recommendation? Why or why not?

A well-constructed public education campaign is a good form of notification of impaired waterways and potential health hazards. DPWES is continuing to work with the Division of

Water Resources #6 Continued

Environmental Health to ensure that the program is effective and efficient in protecting the health of Fairfax County residents.

Also, as stated above, staff is now working with many Fairfax County high school and middle school students and teachers. This synchronization creates a knowledge base on the potential hazards of elevated *E. coli* levels in our waterways.

What, if any, actions should be taken pursuant to EQAC's recommendation?

The Fairfax County Health Department Water Quality Statement for the Recreational Use of County Streams should be incorporated into the stormwater and watershed outreach and education programs. Coordination among various agencies, including DPWES, Health Department, NVSWCD, OPA, Fairfax County Park Authority and others will ensure that materials, (i.e. brochures, fliers, and notices), are distributed in highly visible areas and have a consistent message and a comprehensive scope.

As was found through the recent USGS study on Accotink Creek, identifying the exact source of fecal contamination in our waterways requires a coordinated multi-agency effort and the use of techniques to identify multiple human source tracers. Agencies such as Stormwater Planning, Health Department, Maintenance and Stormwater Management, and Waste Water Management will continue to work closely to locate and correct probable contaminations.

Do the actions recommended above have any budget implications for FY 2007? If so, please explain.

The bacteriological monitoring program and outreach initiatives will be funded through the one cent on the real estate tax dedication. The one cent of the real estate tax is currently in the county executive's proposed budget.

Do the actions recommended above have any longer-range fiscal implications? If so, please explain.

The continued one cent of the real estate tax dedication will provide program stability, accommodate growth, and continuity across fiscal years.

Response to 2005 EQAC Recommendation

Recommendation: Water Resources #7

(Page 113 of the Annual Report on the Environment)

EQAC Recommendation:

EQAC is pleased to note the MS4 requirement to develop a long-term watershed monitoring program to verify the effectiveness and adequacy of stormwater management goals and identify areas of water quality improvement or degradations. EQAC further recommends a monitoring program to evaluate the effectiveness of stormwater detention facilities. While EQAC understands that a comprehensive countywide program to monitor effectiveness would be cost-prohibitive, data are still needed, as it is still unclear as to which structures and requirements are effective and working well. At a minimum, monitoring a representative sampling of different types of stormwater facilities throughout the county is recommended.

Lead agencies for this response: DPWES (SWPD)

Coordinating agency(ies) for this response: DPWES (LDS)

Please identify a lead agency contact person: Laura Grape

Has this recommendation already been addressed, or is it in the process of being addressed? If so, please provide details.

In calendar year 2006, as part of the MS4 permit requirements, a pilot study will be conducted to determine the effectiveness of various BMP control types. Staff will be contacting EQAC representatives to assist the county with the pilot study's design and development.

A couple of efforts are ongoing to determine the phosphorous, nitrogen, and total suspended solids (TSS) removal efficiencies of site-specific stormwater Best Management Practices to the levels required in Army Corps of Engineers-issued permits and the county's Public Facilities Manual.

For 20 years, the county has engaged in the long-term chemical monitoring of the Kingstowne development on Dogue Creek to assess impacts and protect water quality reaching the Huntley Meadows Park. Initial monitoring focused on total suspended solids to determine the effectiveness of silt removing measures. In recent years, the monitoring program expanded to assess the removal of nutrients by the system of BMPs employed in the watershed. This is to fulfill the requirements of an Army Corps of Engineers permit for the South Van Dorn Street extension project. The results of the expanded monitoring revealed that the performances of the existing BMPs are not meeting expected levels and that further analysis is needed to determine the cause.

Another aspect of the permit compliance involved restoration of badly eroded streams in the area to help reduce TSS. In this regard, the county has signed an agreement with the Northern

Water Resources #7

Continued

Virginia Soil and Water Conservation District to partner in the restoration of the downstream portion of a tributary to Dogue Creek. It is believed that once the restoration is complete, the Army Corps of Engineers requirements for nutrient monitoring will have been met and further monitoring for the permit might not be needed. The ongoing biological monitoring conducted through the Northern Virginia Soil and Water Conservation District's volunteer monitoring program, will continue.

In calendar year 2005, several innovative BMPs were constructed at the Providence District Government Center and Merrifield Fire and Rescue - Station 30 (http://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/providence/dcr_project_update.htm). Prior to the construction of the 680 square foot bioretention basin (rain garden), 1,550 square foot permeable pavement, and 240 square foot green roof, the site's stormwater runoff was monitored, using an automated ISCO sampler. First flush data was collected every fifteen minutes over a three hour period to determine the event mean concentration for the following parameters: pH, nitrogen, phosphorous, and total suspended solids (TSS). Post-construction monitoring is scheduled to be conducted using the same methods and parameters, in the spring 2006.

If this recommendation has not been (or is not being) addressed, do you concur with the recommendation? Why or why not?

This recommendation is currently being addressed.

What, if any, actions should be taken pursuant to EQAC's recommendation?

Do the actions recommended above have any budget implications for FY 2007? If so, please explain.

A portion of the penny on the Real Estate Tax dedicated to the stormwater management program is being used to fund the county's MS4 program.

Do the actions recommended above have any longer-range fiscal implications? If so, please explain.

Based on the results of the planned pilot study, the county may consider expanding the program to monitor the pollutant removal efficiencies of more stormwater BMPs. To implement a countywide program of inspecting the effectiveness of county stormwater facilities would require significant increases in funding and staff resources.

Response to 2005 EQAC Recommendation

Recommendation: Water Resources #8

(Page 114 of the Annual Report on the Environment)

EQAC Recommendation:

As the need for dredging of stormwater management ponds continues to increase due to impacts associated with increased impervious surfaces in addition to lack of on-site detention for developments, pond owners will need assistance to carry out this necessary maintenance. The county maintains many of the stormwater management ponds; however homeowners' associations (HOAs) and other private pond owners also have ponds with sediment problems. It is becoming more difficult to dredge and remove excess materials from ponds as a result of rising expenses, the increasing need to dredge more frequently due to increased sediment loading, and lack of local, adequate disposal areas. Developing partnerships between Fairfax County, the Park Authority, HOAs and private pond owners and creating spoil disposal/recycling areas in various parts of the county should be considered, especially since these efforts culminate in improving the county's water resources. Dredge material could be recycled and/or used to renovate athletic fields, thereby reducing maintenance costs. As dredging needs continue to increase, it seems necessary and beneficial to explore options. The county could consider the possibility of this being a revenue-generating operation.

Lead agencies for this response: DPWES (SWPD)

Coordinating agency(ies) for this response: **DPWES (LDS & MSMD); FCPA; NVSWCD**

Please identify a lead agency contact person: Laura Grape

Has this recommendation already been addressed, or is it in the process of being addressed? If so, please provide details.

If this recommendation has not been (or is not being) addressed, do you concur with the recommendation? Why or why not?

Staff concurs this is an emerging issues that will require considerable evaluation. There are wide-ranging implications and the potential for considerable costs and liability for the county. Preliminary considerations have indicated there is little potential for revenue generation through use of the dredged material.

There is uncertainty about the application of dredged sediments and concerns about the use of these materials on athletic fields due to the content of the soils and their suitability for a given application.

What, if any, actions should be taken pursuant to EQAC's recommendation?

Water Resources #8

Continued

Criteria need to be developed to justify the use of county funds for the treatment of private stormwater management facilities. More analysis and study needs to be conducted to assess:

- Costs
- Public vs. private benefits
- Potential uses of dredged materials
- Liability and other legal issues, and
- Spoil disposal locations

Partnering with private industry, such as building and construction industry, large nurseries, consultants who are directly involved in the design and construction of wetland habitats and local or state universities would be helpful in the development of these criteria.

Develop an ongoing maintenance dredging program for Park Authority facilities, where successful dredging and reuse projects have already occurred, such as Lake Accotink. This may not be applicable for all ponds where the soils do not meet the county's strict composition requirements.

Do the actions recommended above have any budget implications for FY 2007? If so, please explain.

There is potential for fiscal implications pending any change to existing policies regarding the treatment of private stormwater management facilities.

Do the actions recommended above have any longer-range fiscal implications? If so, please explain.

Yes, if the county was to assume responsibility for all private stormwater management facilities, there would be significant budget implications and a need for additional staff resources.

Response to 2005 EQAC Recommendation

Recommendation: Water Resources #9

(Page 114 of the Annual Report on the Environment)

EQAC Recommendation:

EQAC commends the county for its existing stream protection requirements for perennial streams, which increased from over 600 miles to over 900 miles as a result of the perennial stream mapping program. EQAC further encourages the Board of Supervisors to support future protective measures for intermittent and headwater streams such as the establishment of protective buffers on either side of a stream.

Lead agencies for this response: DPWES (SWPD)

Coordinating agency(ies) for this response: **DPZ; DPWES (LDS); FCPA**

Please identify a lead agency contact person: Laura Grape

Has this recommendation already been addressed, or is it in the process of being addressed? If so, please provide details.

A draft "Stream Protection Tools Matrix" detailing various options for stream protection was prepared and presented to the Planning Commission's Environment Committee and EQAC, for their consideration. Two joint meetings of these committees have been held to discuss options for stream protection, and staff anticipates continuation of these discussions in 2006. Currently, at the request of the Environment Committee and EQAC, staff is performing a representative analysis across the county to determine the impacts of applying a 50- or 100-foot buffer around non-perennial streams, with the exclusion of road-side ditches. This process requires extensive analysis and editing of the Fairfax Hydrography Dataset (FHD) layer, in GIS, providing a more accurate inventory of streams in Fairfax County.

Staff also revised sections of the Chesapeake Bay Preservation Ordinance and Public Facilities Manual on reclassifying perennial determinations on the Chesapeake Bay Preservation Area maps.

If this recommendation has not been (or is not being) addressed, do you concur with the recommendation? Why or why not?

The protection of non-perennial streams is not currently required by local, state, or federal regulations. Staff often negotiates commitments for the designation and protection of stream valleys associated with non-perennial streams through the county's Environmental Quality Corridor policy. However, this policy is only applied during the development review process (reviews of rezoning, special exception, special permit, variance, and related applications) and is not applied for "by right" development. Further, protection of headwaters areas is not pursued

Water Resources #9 Continued

uniformly when the Environmental Quality Corridor policy is applied—each site that is subject to the development review process has its own unique circumstances, and determinations of EQC boundaries are made, applying Comprehensive Plan guidance, on a case-by-case basis during this process based on these circumstances.

Staff supports the continuation of discussions that have begun regarding the protection of non-perennial streams and recommends that both the benefits and implications of expanded riparian buffer area protection efforts be considered closely through a review by the Planning Commission's Environment Committee. A number of factors should be considered, including the benefits that riparian buffer area preservation provides, the application of regulation vs. policy guidance, the extent of protection to be pursued, implications to stormwater management facility siting, and overall density and site design implications. The maps that are being prepared should provide considerable insight regarding potential benefits and implications of different approaches and should serve to focus the discussion on appropriate tools to apply to the attainment of stream protection objectives.

What, if any, actions should be taken pursuant to EQAC's recommendation?

As noted above, staff recommends continuation of the discussions that have begun on this issue by the Planning Commission's Environment Committee in coordination with EQAC.

Establishing and restoring deficient streamside buffers along perennial streams within existing Resource Protection Areas also warrants significant attention. The 2002 Stream Physical Assessment study indicates a total of 2,566 deficient buffer locations throughout the county, five percent of which are rated as severely deficient. While the county and its numerous partners are working to restore streamside buffers on public lands (www.fairfaxcounty.gov/dpwes/stormwater/riparianbuffer), deficient sites on homeowners' association properties and private properties are currently being addressed in a limited capacity under this program. The county should identify options to assist homeowners associations and private landowners with the costs of restoration.

Do the actions recommended above have any budget implications for FY 2007? If so, please explain.

Continued discussions of stream protection issues and options are not expected to result in requests for additional funding; however, these discussions will continue to require significant amounts of staff time that would otherwise be available for other initiatives.

Performing a detailed analysis of stream buffer impacts across the entire county would require assistance from an outside consultant.

Do the actions recommended above have any longer-range fiscal implications? If so, please explain.

We do not anticipate long-range fiscal impact, but much will depend on the outcome of the ongoing discussion.

Response to 2005 EQAC Recommendation

Recommendation: Hazardous Materials #1

(Page 157 of the Annual Report on the Environment)

EQAC Recommendation:

EQAC continues to recommend an aggressive public education campaign on how to properly dispose of household/residential, commercial, and industrial hazardous waste. Continuous partnering with the Northern Virginia Board of Realtors and solid waste haulers to distribute information to all new residents in the county is suggested. New residents would be anybody buying or renting a house, townhouse, or condominium. Waste removal companies could be asked to include an information letter with their mailings to their customers. Creative use of other organizations is also encouraged.

Lead agencies for this response: DPWES (SWD&RRD)

Coordinating agency(ies) for this response: OPA; DPWES (SWC&RD)

Please identify a lead agency contact person: Charlie Forbes

Has this recommendation already been addressed, or is it in the process of being addressed? If so, please provide details.

The recommendation is in the process of being addressed through a series of activities, organized by the two separate and distinct waste streams (and regulations) that are involved: hazardous wastes generated by residents (also known as Household Hazardous Waste, or HHW) versus hazardous wastes generated by commercial and industrial establishments. Whenever appropriate, news releases are prepared for every event described herein, distributed to the media, and included in "Newslink", the daily E-mail newsletter to County employees. Specific County actions that respond to the recommendations are summarized under separate headings as follows:

1. Household Hazardous Waste--

- a. **Expanded/Mobile HHW Recovery Events** – In addition to the permanent HHW drop-off sites maintained at County's two Citizens Disposal Facilities at the I-66 Transfer Station and the I-95 Landfill Complex, funding has been secured to establish a total of five additional HHW collection events at remote sites throughout the County. These events will be advertised using the outreach methods described elsewhere in this response.
- b. **Partnering with Northern Virginia Board of Realtors (NVAR)** – County staff will re-invigorate its earlier work with NVAR, exploring the ability to update the education and outreach materials previously distributed through this organization.

Hazardous Materials #1

Continued

- c. **Distributing Information through Solid Waste Haulers** – DPWES' Solid Waste Program publishes a monthly newsletter which is included with its invoices to solid waste collectors that use the County's waste disposal sites. This newsletter includes repeated, timely articles that encourage collectors to notify their residential customers of upcoming special waste management events, including those that target HHW.
- d. **Upgraded Internet Presence** – Information about the County's HHW program has been updated and re-organized on the County's website. It is anticipated that this upgrade will make finding HHW information on the site easier, while ensuring that the most accurate and timely information is available at all times. Work to improve the clarity of the County's message in this area has, in turn, prompted a similar upgrade in other County education and outreach materials on HHW.
- e. **Creative Use of Other Organizations** – "News to Use", a monthly E-mail newsletter distributed by the County's Office of Public Affairs, periodically offers information on HHW disposal through the County's two Citizens Disposal Facilities. Brochures and other materials are made available at community events throughout the year, including the Earth Day-Arbor Day celebrations, the Celebrate Fairfax and Fall for Fairfax festivals, and other County-sponsored events.
- f. **Partnering with Targeted Retail Outlets** – County staff is working to establish partnerships with selected retail outlets (e.g., Lowes, Home Depot, Crown Paints) to establish an education and outreach presence within their stores. The intent here is to target customers who buy materials and supplies which, after use, tend to become HHW.

2. Commercial/Industrial Hazardous Waste--

- a. **Special Events** – As it has for three consecutive years now, DPWES' Solid Waste Program will offer three Conditionally Exempt Small Quantity Generator (CESQG) events during the course of the year. These events allow businesses that generate small quantities of hazardous waste to properly dispose of their hazardous in a cost-effective manner. These events, scheduled for April 12, July 26, and October 4, 2006, will be advertised using the outreach methods described elsewhere in this response.
- b. **Partnering with the Fairfax Chamber of Commerce** – County staff will re-invigorate its earlier work with the Chamber, exploring the ability to update the information previously distributed through this organization.
- c. **Distributing Information through Solid Waste Haulers** – As described earlier, the County publishes a monthly newsletter that encourages waste collectors to notify their commercial customers of upcoming CESQG events.
- d. **Targeted Mailings** – the County distributes "RecycleWorks", a newsletter sent to all businesses required by County Code to prepare annual recycling reports. This newsletter included articles about recycling various hazardous components of the waste stream, such as rechargeable batteries and fluorescent lamps.

Hazardous Materials #1

Continued

- e. **Upgraded Internet Presence** – As described earlier, the County’s special waste management program presence on the internet has been updated and re-organized, making it easier to find information on County support to CESQG businesses.
- f. **Partnering with Targeted Wholesale and Supply Outlets** – County staff is working to establish partnerships with selected business-to-business establishments (e.g., paint and painting supply wholesalers) to establish an education and outreach presence for their customer base, targeting businesses who buy materials and supplies which, after use, tend to become hazardous waste.

If this recommendation has not been (or is not being) addressed, do you concur with the recommendation? Why or why not?

The recommendation is being addressed. However, an aspect of the recommendation that may prove difficult to implement is asking waste removal companies to include outreach materials in their mailings to their customers. Historically, these stakeholders have been very resistant to such a move, as many are small companies that struggle to absorb the additional special handling and mailing costs that are involved. The distribution of most outreach and education materials by the haulers is accomplished by door-to-door posting of materials by collection crews or other hauler staff already in the field (i.e., delivery of materials is “free”).

What, if any, actions should be taken pursuant to EQAC’s recommendation?

The plan is being implemented as discussed above.

Do the actions recommended above have any budget implications for FY 2007? If so, please explain.

Staff anticipates that the necessary funding and staffing resources will be available.

NOTE: The requested funding covers outreach and education activities only, and does not include the cost of managing hazardous wastes delivered to County facilities. Typically, the businesses that generated these wastes pay for the cost of handling and disposal.

Do the actions recommended above have any longer-range fiscal implications? If so, please explain.

The public outreach/education efforts described above are supported by established County solid waste management initiatives, and are therefore included in the operating budget for the County’s solid waste programs. As the cost for such efforts increase, staff will continue to find ways to maximize allocated funding through partnerships with community and business organizations, and exploring ways to cooperate with other local jurisdictions through appropriate regional organizations.

Response to 2005 EQAC Recommendation

Recommendation: Hazardous Materials #2

(Page 157 of the Annual Report on the Environment)

EQAC Recommendation:

EQAC recognizes the County's ability to collect rechargeable batteries at the I-66 transfer station, the I-95 SW site, and special programs with the business community. Schools and other organizations should be encouraged to come up with creative initiatives to promote significant increases in recycling rechargeable batteries. Possible sites to house recycling drop off bins should be explored, such as outlying areas of parking lots. With the growing popularity and use of rechargeable battery products, especially cellular phones, EQAC recommends an aggressive program to promote recycling of NiCad rechargeable batteries.

Lead agencies for this response: DPWES (Solid Waste Collection & Recycling)

Coordinating agency(ies) for this response: DPWES (Solid Waste Disposal & Resource Recovery); FCPS

Please identify a lead agency contact person: Pamela Gratton

Has this recommendation already been addressed, or is it in the process of being addressed? If so, please provide details.

Fairfax County is in the process of implementing a comprehensive rechargeable battery recycling program for county residents and businesses. Elements of this plan are as follows:

- The Fairfax County Solid Waste Management Program has partnered with the Rechargeable Battery Recycling Corporation (RBRC) to recycle rechargeable batteries. RBRC is an industry-funded group that has created a program where any organization in the US can ship rechargeable batteries to a recycling facility for processing at *no charge to the organization*. Please visit the RBRC website at www.RBRC.org for details about their extensive program. The county has placed rechargeable battery collection boxes in several offices of the Fairfax County government as well as all Board of Supervisors offices. Battery boxes are collected by county staff and shipped to the RBRC recycling facility for processing. Rechargeable battery collection boxes are also in place at the Household Hazardous Waste (HHW) facilities at both of the county's solid waste complexes. Electronic notices about the locations of rechargeable battery collection boxes were sent to all county employees and posters about the collection program have been placed in high-visibility locations in county offices.
- The county website has been updated to add an entire page devoted to the proper management of all batteries. Included on this webpage are details about how to recycle

Hazardous Materials #2

Continued

rechargeable batteries and a list of locations within the county where rechargeable batteries can be recycled. The website is <http://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/dpwes/recycling/mat-bat.htm>.

- County staff is in the process of implementing a new public education campaign about recycling rechargeable batteries to county residents. This campaign is envisioned to involve the development of educational information with details about how to recycle rechargeable batteries. As a first step, this educational material will be distributed by mail to all of the county's refuse and recyclables collection customers in calendar 2006 (about 43,000 residences).
- Fairfax County initiated discussions within NVRC about developing a regional approach to providing information about recycling electronics and other items that contain toxic components. One of the items targeted for this outreach program is rechargeable batteries. The outreach program is slated to address the management of fluorescent bulbs first and eventually, rechargeable batteries will be included. The program will be comprised of a website, entitled KnowToxics.com, and brochures that will be distributed within communities to businesses and residents. This program will be launched in the spring of 2006.
- The RBRC has developed professional television commercials addressing the benefits of their rechargeable battery recycling program. County staff is working with the Department of Cable Communications and Consumer Affairs to air these Public Service Announcements (PSAs) on Channel 16. Information about where the rechargeable batteries can be recycled in Fairfax County will be added to these PSAs and they will be aired in the spring of 2006.
- County staff includes rechargeable battery recycling in all recycling events conducted in the county. In calendar year 2005, four events were held where rechargeable batteries were collected for recycling. Two of these events were conducted in partnership with Fairfax County Public Schools.

If this recommendation has not been (or is not being) addressed, do you concur with the recommendation? Why or why not?

The recommendation is being addressed.

What, if any, actions should be taken pursuant to EQAC's recommendation?

EQAC's recommendation has been embraced and implemented as described above.

Do the actions recommended above have any budget implications for FY 2007? If so, please explain.

Additional outreach efforts may be developed and as such, will be included in budget planning.

Do the actions recommended above have any longer-range fiscal implications? If so, please explain.

Hazardous Materials #2

Continued

The ultimate goal of the partnership with RBRC is to work with their corporate members to ensure that they have collection boxes in their establishments located within Fairfax County (such as Radio Shack, Best Buys, etc.) with staff trained to understand how the program works. This will significantly increase the number of locations where rechargeable batteries can be recycled. These partnerships will be formed when corporate sponsors commit to placing the boxes high visibility locations as well as committing resources to training all staff on a continuous basis about the program. When the county receives these commitments, staff will work to enhance the public outreach campaign to distribute information about additional locations where rechargeable batteries can be recycled.

Response to 2005 EQAC Recommendation

Recommendation: Hazardous Materials #3

(Page 158 of the Annual Report on the Environment)

EQAC Recommendation:

EQAC continues to advertise and educate the public regarding the types of hazardous materials and other environmental situations citizens are requested to report, including whom they are to contact. Possible avenues are community association newsletters, press release stories to the media, and age appropriate material sent home through the schools. Avenues that are not connected with environmental information should be explored to reach people not drawn to environmental events.

Lead agencies for this response: Fire & Rescue

Coordinating agency(ies) for this response: OPA; FCPS; DPWES; (SWPD & LDS)

Please identify a lead agency contact person: Captain I. William Garrett

Has this recommendation already been addressed, or is it in the process of being addressed? If so, please provide details.

This recommendation was addressed in the 2004 EQAC recommendations.

If this recommendation has not been (or is not being) addressed, do you concur with the recommendation? Why or why not?

The Fire & Rescue Department agrees with this recommendation and will continue to work through our Public Information Officer (PIO), the Office of Public Affairs (OPA), and the Fairfax Joint Local Emergency Planning Committee (FJLEPC) to advertise and educate the public regarding the types of hazardous materials and other environmental situations citizens are requested to report.

The Fire & Rescue Department, OPA and the Fairfax Joint Local Emergency Planning Committee (FJLEPC) have worked together for many years to develop educational materials regarding reporting hazardous materials releases in the County. These groups have also identified the need for educational materials to be translated into the core languages, especially concerning the release of hazardous materials. In 2005 the FJLEPC, in partnership with the FRD and Cable Channel 16, released an educational video on the topic of "Shelter in Place" in the event of a chemical emergency in Fairfax County. The video is currently available through the

Hazardous Materials #3

Continued

Fairfax County Public Library System, the County's ELLVIS system, and by request from the FJLEPC Coordinator. A press release by the OPA about the video was picked up by several other publications (Washington Post, Washington Times). The FRD, OPA and FJLEPC continue to work together to develop avenues to disseminate information to the citizens of the County. This includes developing a comprehensive web site for the FJLEPC where newsletters and articles will be made available in PDF format for associations to send to their membership.

The FJLEPC and the staff of the Hazardous Materials and Investigative Services Section of the Fire & Rescue Department also attend Community events, such as Celebrate Fairfax and Fall for Fairfax, where they set up displays, show the Shelter in Place video, and interact with the citizens. The educational materials for these events are usually reproduced from items available from the Environmental Protection Agency and other government entities where materials can be received/reproduced for little or no cost and targets homeowners, parents, and children.

What, if any, actions should be taken pursuant to EQAC's recommendation?

The Fire & Rescue Department, OPA and the FJLEPC will continue to work together to develop avenues for disseminating educational materials regarding the release of hazardous materials, proper disposal of household hazardous waste, and chemical emergency planning. However, resources are very limited and, historically, most of the cost have been solely borne by the FRD (Fire Prevention Division Cost Center) in developing and distributing these materials. Recent budget cuts have resulted in greatly curtailing the efforts to develop additional programs and have caused efforts to focus on maintaining what is currently in place.

There is limited funding available to support the efforts of the FJLEPC in developing and maintaining their web site. A small donation has been the sole source of funding available in support of their efforts. Thus far, the donation has enabled the FJLEPC to pay for web hosting services and domain name registration. The FJLEPC's current web page was designed by a high school student as a community service project; however, the committee would like to develop a more informative website. The Fire & Rescue Department does not have staffing or resources to be able to support the FJLEPC in this endeavor outside developing web content. It is recommended that the County provide funding so the FJLEPC can contract with a webpage developer to develop a professional, informative, and more interactive website where information can easily be disseminated through the use of PDF documents.

An additional hindrance to fully developing educational programs of this type is that the staff position currently assigned as liaison to the FJLEPC and developing educational outreach programs for hazardous materials is an exempt limited term position. Funding this position as merit status would allow the FRD to attract and retain individuals who have experience in marketing and/or emergency preparedness planning to develop the materials necessary for such an extensive outreach program. Merit status gains four weeks of work time each year, allowing for program continuity because the incumbent would not be required to take an annual 4-week break in service.

Hazardous Materials #3

Continued

Do the actions recommended above have any budget implications for FY 2007? If so, please explain.

Neither the Fire & Rescue Department nor the FJLEPC have the budgetary resources to develop, print and market the programs/educational materials that have been identified as a need. In fact, the FJLEPC relies on donations from local businesses to print its brochures regarding proper notification procedures for hazardous materials releases. It would cost approximately \$700 per core language to translate this one brochure, and an additional \$2,000 in printing services (for black/white print only) to print the core language brochures. These costs would be most likely be incurred for each brochure that is developed or revised.

There is additional implication for personnel services if the limited term position is converted to merit status (Management Analyst II, S24). A merit Management Analyst II (S24) mid-point is \$61,633.94 (FY06), plus \$16,450.09 (26.69%) in fringe benefits. This cost would be off-set by a reduction in limited term salaries of \$40,000.

Do the actions recommended above have any longer-range fiscal implications? If so, please explain.

Conversion of the limited term position would result in additional need of Character 20 funding over each subsequent fiscal year due to changes in fringe benefit packages and Pay for Performance Awards. Operational needs for printing and translation services are expected to remain steady due to the need of re-printing/revising of educational materials.

Response to 2005 EQAC Recommendation

Recommendation: Ecological Resources #1

(Pages 194 and 195 of the Annual Report on the Environment)

EQAC Recommendation:

EQAC recommends that the County Board of Supervisors develop and implement a Countywide Natural Resource Management Plan – an ecological resources management plan that can be implemented through the policy and administrative branches of the County government structure. Two necessary tasks should be accomplished first -- prepare and adopt a unified Natural Resource Conservation Policy, and complete a Countywide Baseline Natural Resource Inventory. EQAC notes that slow progress is being made in this area due to efforts by the Fairfax County Park Authority staff in their efforts to establish a natural resources baseline inventory. The FCPA has developed a Countywide Green Infrastructure Map that appears a basis for a Natural Resource Inventory. Additionally, the Urban Forestry Division is continuing efforts to devise a countywide map for use as a layer on the County's GIS that will delineate the distribution of naturally occurring and landscaped vegetation. However, these efforts must be supplemented by an inventory of the County that accounts for flora and fauna. The Park Authority has now prepared a Natural Resources Plan for management of the County's parks. EQAC also notes the accomplishment of the Park Authority in preparing and publishing a Natural Resources Plan for management of the County's parks and urges the Park Authority to fully implement this plan. EQAC fully supports these efforts, urging that they culminate in a Countywide Resource Management Plan. This is a continuing recommendation for past EQAC reports. EQAC's intent is that Fairfax County should have all the tools in place (the policy and the data) to create a plan that will support the active management and conservation of the County's natural resources.

Lead agencies for this response: DPZ (Planning Division)

Coordinating agency(ies) for this response: FCPA; DPWES (Stormwater Planning Division & Urban Forest Management)

Please identify a lead agency contact person: Noel Kaplan

Has this recommendation already been addressed, or is it in the process of being addressed? If so, please provide details.

There are a number of county policies, regulations, and initiatives that are supportive of natural resource conservation (key initiatives relating to vegetative cover mapping, Park Authority activities, and watershed management planning are noted below), and natural resource conservation is a central principle that has been incorporated into the Board of Supervisors' Environmental Agenda. From a

Ecological Resources #1 Continued

policy perspective, Objective 9 of the Environment section of the Policy Plan volume of the county's Comprehensive Plan is of particular note:

“Identify, protect and enhance an integrated network of ecologically valuable land and surface waters for present and future residents of Fairfax County.”

Also of note is Objective 2 of the Parks and Recreation section of the Policy Plan, which reads as follows:

“Protect appropriate land areas in a natural state to ensure preservation of significant and sensitive natural resources.”

As reported in past years, a number of ongoing efforts support this objective and EQAC's recommendation. Of particular importance to the identification of “ecologically valuable land,” and therefore to implementation of this Plan objective and support for EQAC's broader recommendation for a countywide natural resource management plan, is the need to complete a comprehensive survey and mapping of vegetation ecosystems that occur in Fairfax County. As noted in previous responses, this effort is being incorporated into a broader effort to map vegetative ecosystems in Fairfax County, Prince William County, Arlington County, the City of Alexandria, and other associated towns and cities. This mapping effort is applying the National Vegetation Classification System (NVCS) in its identification of plant communities. In 2005, the Urban Forest Management Division (UFM) of the Department of Public Works and Environmental Services continued collecting vegetation plot data in an effort to complete the total number of surveys needed to map the extents of natural plant communities in the multi-jurisdictional study area. The area of the Northern Virginia jurisdictions involved requires detailed biotic (species composition, vertical and horizontal structure, and diameter classes) and abiotic (geomorphology, soil composition, moisture regime, slopes, and aspect) data from approximately 600 tenth acre vegetation plots in order to ensure a high level of mapping accuracy (designed for a 90 percent confidence level, with 5 percent accuracy range). To date, UFM has collected data from 334 plots located on parkland and open space scattered throughout the Triassic basin, Piedmont and Coastal Plain areas of the study area.

To assist in the mapping effort UFM obtained a comprehensive list of NVCS vegetation communities thought to exist in Northern Virginia from the Virginia Department of Conservation and Recreation. A total of 43 vegetation communities have been identified (a table describing each of these communities can be provided upon request). These data should greatly assist UFM staff in delineating the communities down to both the alliance and association levels (the highest levels of community description) of the NVCS. It is anticipated that a countywide NVCS dataset based on 2002/2003 satellite imagery will be completed in late 2007.

Automated vegetation mapping down to the NVCS alliance level is dependent upon consistent and accurate supervised spectral classification of satellite imagery via image analysis software. This success of this process is not a given at this point and will largely be determined by the quality of the spectral data contained in the satellite imagery and the capacity of the image analysis software and human operators to aggregate spectral signatures into polygons that reflect the actual extents of vegetation communities, many of which do not have easily discernible

Ecological Resources #1

Continued

boundaries, but are divided by ecotomes (transition zones between communities) of varying width and composition.

If the spectral analysis results in acceptable confidence levels via field verification, then the vegetation mapping process will be greatly accelerated. If the spectral analysis fails to produce consistently accurate results, then it is likely that follow-up field work will be needed to refine the dataset where more than one community type produces similar spectral responses. If the spectral analysis cannot be improved via additional data collection, then the mapping will need to be completed without the benefits of automation. In either case, additional time will be needed to complete the mapping project.

UFM has identified funding to acquire updated satellite imagery in the summer of 2007, and to contract-out the spectral analysis component of the mapping project. Once the new imagery is analyzed, staff will update the NVCS dataset to reflect conditions found at the time of image acquisition.

The Fairfax County Park Authority's (FCPA's) Natural Resource Management Plan (NRMP), which was adopted by the Park Authority Board in January, 2004, emphasizes the need for baseline inventories of flora and fauna in county parks. As FCPA implements the NRMP, it will be evaluating methods to add to and improve upon data already available and to determine the most effective way to leverage resources to get the best possible information on FCPA's land holdings (consisting of over 23,000 acres of land). FCPA and UFM are coordinating on how their respective efforts can complement and augment one another; the two entities will continue to coordinate on these efforts, and the collective experience of these two entities should prove helpful in developing a county-wide inventory. In addition, the Park Authority's experience in developing an Agency wide NRMP should prove helpful in an effort to develop a countywide plan.

In terms of implementing the Park Authority Natural Resource Management Plan, FCPA has identified an annual need of over \$2 million to implement the plan. FCPA continues to seek funding through the budget process and has been successful in including a significant amount of funding in the 2004 Park Bond, including \$1.3 million for cultural and natural resources protection and preservation and \$1.0 million for stream stabilization (with stream stabilization projects being coordinated with the Department of Public Works and Environmental Services and watershed management plans) in the 2004 Park Bond. FCPA also received support as part of the carryover funding the Board of Supervisors designated for projects related to the Environmental Agenda (funding was allocated for Invasives Removal, Trail Mapping, Geographic Information Systems, Stewardship Education, and Low Impact Development Demonstration projects).

Another effort related to natural resource management planning is the development of watershed management plans for all thirty of the county's watersheds. These watershed management plans are focusing on the ecological values of the county's aquatic habitats and are identifying a comprehensive suite of efforts necessary to protect those aquatic resources with high ecological value and to restore those resources that have been degraded. The Watershed Management Plans for Little Hunting Creek and Popes Head Creek are complete and have been approved by the

Ecological Resources #1 Continued

county's Board of Supervisors. Over the next calendar year, approximately 60 percent of the county will have watershed plans developed, with 100 percent completed by 2010.

The Cub Run and Bull Run Watershed Planning effort is working in parallel with the Sully Woodlands Master Planning effort to ensure the pursuit of common goals for the protection, restoration, and enhancement of open space, natural and cultural resources.

As is stated under water resources recommendation #9, staff is analyzing and editing the streams layer in the county's GIS in order to incorporate storm sewer structures identified on the new storm sewer infrastructure data layer that was compiled in 2005.

If this recommendation has not been (or is not being) addressed, do you concur with the recommendation? Why or why not?

Staff concurs with EQAC's recommendation.

What, if any, actions should be taken pursuant to EQAC's recommendation?

The efforts noted above should continue. The Park Authority Natural Resource Management Plan requires significant funding to be fully implemented (over \$2 million per year needed). Interagency coordination should be strengthened in order to monitor and to openly communicate the progress of individual agency efforts to determine how they may be consolidated to serve as a foundation for the larger effort recommended by EQAC.

The completion of the vegetation community mapping effort described above is a necessary prerequisite to the establishment of a framework for improving the county's ability to identify ecologically valuable land. In anticipation of completion of this effort, staff from a number of agencies should coordinate on the consolidation of natural resource data that can be assessed in conjunction with the vegetation community data; modeling principles similar to those applied to the Fairfax County Park Authority's Green Infrastructure model should be considered in the development of a more comprehensive, robust ecological resource modeling exercise, and data gaps should be identified. Interagency coordination efforts are under way and should continue.

Do the actions recommended above have any budget implications for FY 2007? If so, please explain.

Interagency coordination efforts will proceed using existing staff resources. However, it is possible that an outcome of this coordination will be a request for consultant support.

Watershed management plan development and implementation will continue to be funded from the Board's adoption of a one-cent dedication of tax revenues for stormwater programs. The continuation of the stormwater funding dedication should be supported as part of the FY 2007 Budget.

Ecological Resources #1

Continued

No additional FY 2007 funding will be requested to support the NVCS vegetation mapping project, as the project is proceeding through grant funding.

Do the actions recommended above have any longer-range fiscal implications? If so, please explain.

The Park Authority NRMP requires significant funding (over \$2 million needed annually to be fully implemented).

Additional resource needs may be identified in the future. It should be anticipated that significant resources would be needed to support the development, implementation, and continued maintenance of a Natural Resource Management Plan.

The continued real estate tax dedication will provide program stability for the watershed planning effort, accommodate growth and provide continuity across fiscal years.

Response to 2005 EQAC Recommendation

Recommendation: Ecological Resources #2

(Page 195 of the Annual Report on the Environment)

EQAC Recommendation:

In past Annual Reports, EQAC recommended that the County Board of Supervisors emphasize public-private partnerships that use private actions such as purchase of land and easement by existing or new land trusts to protect forests and other natural resources, including champion/historic trees. With the signing of a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the Board of Supervisors and the Northern Virginia Conservation Trust, such a public-private partnership came into being. Thus, EQAC's recommendation has been satisfied. EQAC continues to commend the Board of Supervisors for this action and recommends continued support for this partnership. EQAC notes that the MOU was for a three-year period and this period is over. While the Board of Supervisors continues to fund the public-private partnership with NVCT, no new MOU has been put into place by Fairfax County. Since this interjects uncertainty into the future of this program, and the program has proved its value, EQAC recommends that an MOU covering a three-year or five-year period be put into place.

Lead agencies for this response: DPZ (Planning Division)

Coordinating agency(ies) for this response: FCPA; NVCT

Please identify a lead agency contact person: John Bell, Planner II, DPZ

Has this recommendation already been addressed, or is it in the process of being addressed? If so, please provide details.

Staff agrees with EQAC that the Northern Virginia Conservation Trust has proven its value to the county. NVCT has been an effective partner in protecting valuable environmental and heritage resources through negotiation of conservation easements, and staff supports the continuation of this partnership into the future. Funding was appropriated to the Northern Virginia Conservation Trust for FY 06 for \$258,120; this level of funding is similar to that provided in FY 05, allowing for 3% growth to account for inflation. The proposed FY 2007 budget includes a \$266,380 contribution to NVCT; funding by the Board of Supervisors this coming year will mark the sixth consecutive year that the county has funded the NVCT.

If this recommendation has not been (or is not being) addressed, do you concur with the recommendation? Why or why not?

Staff supports contributory agency status for NVCT and notes that this funding mechanism has been effective in supporting a number of nonsectarian, nonprofit, and quasi-governmental

Ecological Resources #2

Continued

organizations that promote the general health and welfare of the county. In FY 2006, over \$10,000,000 was disbursed to such organizations through the Contributory Fund, and over \$11,000,000 is proposed in the FY 2007 budget. No further action is required. The Board of Supervisors will determine on a year-to-year basis the funding that can be allocated to NVCT.

What, if any, actions should be taken pursuant to EQAC's recommendation?

Staff believes that no further action is required.

Do the actions recommended above have any budget implications for FY 2007? If so, please explain.

Staff recommends that, consistent with fiscal circumstances, the Board of Supervisors continue to fund NVCT at a level similar to what has been provided in recent years, with annual increases as appropriate to account for inflation.

Do the actions recommended above have any longer-range fiscal implications? If so, please explain.

If the Board of Supervisors approves funding for NVCT for FY 2007, there would be no commitment for the following year; however, depending upon performance of NVCT and the county's ability to fund it, it would appear that the amount funded this year would or could be replicated in future years.

Response to 2004 EQAC Recommendation

Recommendation: Ecological Resources #3

(Page 195 of the Annual Report on the Environment)

EQAC Recommendation:

EQAC recommends that the BOS continue to support proposals to amend Virginia State Code §15.2-961, allowing the county to enact tree preservation ordinances.

Lead agencies for this response: DPWES (Urban Forest Management)

Coordinating agency(ies) for this response: None

Please identify a lead agency contact person: Michael Knapp

Has this recommendation already been addressed, or is it in the process of being addressed? If so, please provide details.

This recommendation has already been addressed.

Staff concurs that the County should continue to pursue new tree preservation legislation or amendments to existing Virginia State Code § 15.2-961 at the Virginia General Assembly.

Since Fairfax County's local ordinance is taking full advantage of Virginia State Code relating to tree preservation, attempts to strengthen local tree preservation and tree cover requirements must be preceded by new enabling language. In reaction to the current limitations of the State Code, Fairfax County has attempted to increase its local tree preservation authority for three of the last four years by seeking amendments to the tree cover provisions of § 15.2-961. The recent legislative attempts to increase local authority to require tree preservation and are listed below in chronological order:

- **2002:** Fairfax County initiated a proposal to amend State Code § 15.2-961 as part of its 2002 Legislative Program. Senate Bill 484 and House Bill 105 were submitted by Fairfax and Prince William Counties as proposals to change the core concept of § 15.2-961 from tree replacement to tree conservation, with a strong emphasis on tree preservation. Both bills were introduced in the 2002 Virginia State Legislative Assembly, but were tabled until the 2003 session due to opposition by the Virginia Building Association.
- **2003:** SB484 and HB105 were later terminated as viable legislation due to a Virginia State Legislative Assembly funding crisis.
- **2004:** For the third consecutive year, staff from the Department of Public Works and Environmental Services forwarded proposed amendments to State Code § 15.2-961, to the Board of Supervisor's Legislative Committee. In light of two previous years of

Ecological Resources #3

Continued

substantial opposition to the proposed amendments in the Virginia Legislative Assembly and unwillingness by local Virginia State policy makers to patronize a similar proposal adopted in the previous Legislative Program, the Legislative Committee chose not to include the proposal in the 2004 Legislative Program.

- **2004:** Local Virginia State Delegate Mark D. Sickles (House District 43) patronized HB1479, which proposed the same tree preservation amendments originally contained in SB484. On January 23, 2004, HB1479 was referred to the Committee on Counties, Cities and Towns; however, on February 11, 2004 the Committee voted to continue the bill to the 2005 Legislative Assembly.
- **2005:** The 2005 Fairfax County Legislative Program contains two tree-related matters: a legislative position supporting HB1479 which is a proposal to amend § 15.2-961 so that the existing tree cover requirements place higher emphasis on tree preservation; and, a proposed resolution concerning the use of tree preservation and planting measures in Virginia's air quality management plan.
- **2006:** The 2006 Fairfax County Legislative Program contains a general legislative position supporting tree preservation legislation. Virginia State Senator Patricia Ticer introduced SB 236, which is virtually identical to legislation prepared by Fairfax County Staff in 2003. SB 236 was a proposal to amend § 15.2-961 which would allow jurisdictions in Northern Virginia to adopt local tree conservation ordinances that place a strong emphasis on tree preservation. Unfortunately, SB 236 was referred to the Senate Committee on Local Government, but was "passed by indefinitely" (failed).

If this recommendation has not been (or is not being) addressed, do you concur with the recommendation? Why or why not?

NA

What, if any, actions should be taken pursuant to EQAC's recommendation?

Do the actions recommended above have any budget implications for FY 2006? If so, please explain.

None

Do the actions recommended above have any longer-range fiscal implications? If so, please explain

None

Response to 2005 EQAC Recommendation

Recommendation: Ecological Resources #4

(Page 195 of the Annual Report on the Environment)

EQAC Recommendation:

Fairfax County no longer has Soil Scientist expertise on the County Staff. EQAC has in the past recommended that the Board of Supervisors reestablish this expertise. The Board of Supervisors did not establish staff positions in response to this EQAC recommendation; however, it did provide funding to the Northern Soil and Water Conservation District (NVSWCD) for mapping of the County's soils. The funding is through 2007. This enabled NVSWCD to provide the needed expertise. There is, however, a continuing need for this expertise in the County past 2007. The incident on Telegraph Road where a hillside slid into Telegraph Road and endangered homes at the crest of the hill points out the soils problems that exist in the County. The increasing urbanization of the County has created new types of soils – urban man-made soils. These soils can have different characteristics in water infiltration and erosion. Therefore, as various projects are started in these soils, including stream restoration and other water control measures, expertise in these soils are needed in the County. At present the only place this expertise exists is in NVSWCD. EQAC therefore recommends that the Board of Supervisors continue the agreement with NVSWCD past 2007 to provide soil scientist expertise.

Lead agencies for this response: NVSWCD

**Coordinating agency(ies) for this response: DIT; DPWES (SWPD, MSMD, & LDS);
Health; FCPA; DTA**

Please identify a lead agency contact person: Diane Hoffman

Has this recommendation already been addressed, or is it in the process of being addressed? If so, please provide details.

This recommendation has not yet been addressed. The soil scientist position in the NVSWCD is funded through June 2007.

However, discussions regarding the comments and concerns expressed by EQAC in the background information and recommendations in the 2004 and 2005 Annual Reports, and the future need for a soil scientist, have been discussed by staff and those who are members of the Soil Survey Users Group. This group is comprised of County staff from: DPWES – LDS (ESRD and EFID), SWPD, MSMD and UFM; DPZ; Health; Tax Administration; FCPA; DIT-GIS; and staff from VCE, NVSWCD and NRCS.

Ecological Resources #4

Continued

If this recommendation has not been (or is not being) addressed, do you concur with the recommendation? Why or why not?

Staff concurs with the recommendation that the expertise of a soil scientist is needed in the County, beyond the completion of the soil survey update. A soil scientist will be needed to maintain and update the County's soil survey, to evaluate and interpret soils information, to conduct soils investigations, to provide advice to internal and external customers, and to lead training and education programs on soils and the appropriate and effective use of soils maps and soils information.

A soil scientist will be needed to act as a custodian and librarian for the updated soil survey and to maintain the integrity of the information. A soil survey is a dynamic document that changes as land use changes alter the landscape. The GIS Department has stated that a custodian needs to be designated as responsible for the maintenance of the County's Soil Survey. There also will be an initial need to integrate the updated survey into the County's GIS. The Soil Survey consists of a map showing the location of the soils and a large database with massive amounts of information about each soil's chemical, biological, and physical characteristics. The National Soils Information System (NASIS) database for the County will need to be updated on an on-going basis.

A soil scientist is needed to evaluate and interpret soils information. Without guidance, the soil survey easily can be misused or be too complicated for customers to navigate. The soil scientist will know and understand the broad body of knowledge about soils, the location and type of information contained in the survey, and what is needed for what purpose. The soil scientist will be able to direct customers, both county staff and the public sector, to the information they need. Also, it is of paramount importance that the soils information is properly and effectively used and that the improper uses of the survey are explained to all users. When properly used, the information in the Soil Survey, which will be certified to national standards, is defensible in court.

The information in the Soil Survey is for general planning purposes and will not eliminate the need for site-specific surveys when construction or changes in site use occur. In certain cases, the County's soil scientist may conduct soils investigations. In other cases, soils expertise will be needed to evaluate site-specific surveys conducted by private-sector soil scientists on behalf of their clients. At present the site-specific surveys submitted to the County as part of the site plan review process cannot, and should not, be incorporated as updates to the official Fairfax County Soil Survey. They have not been subject to the strict quality assurance protocols and certification to national standards that are being used in the County's Soil Survey update.

Knowledge of soils is critical to planning for stormwater controls, particularly low-impact-development practices and innovative measures, which are gaining recognition as important stormwater management tools. The soil scientist currently on staff has conducted numerous infiltration tests during the past two years for DPWES, FCPA and NVSWCD for projects installed in the County to demonstrate bio-infiltration swales, underground detention, and rain gardens. There will be a growing need to continue to measure a site's infiltration capacity and other soil hydrodynamic properties, which will aid in the design and location of infiltration

Ecological Resources #4

Continued

practices. The effectiveness of LID practices could be evaluated based on percolation, in-situ soils, and infiltration rates. Also, the soil scientist could provide technical assistance on using the GIS layer for modeling purposes to evaluate potential infiltration rates and stormwater management control effectiveness. It may be possible to produce a map of good infiltration areas, which could be used for LID projects and the placement of septic systems.

A soil scientist can be a resource for determining potential wetland areas, utilizing hydric soils information. This information can also be used to evaluate RPA plans that include wetland delineations. The soil scientist also may assist in the evaluation of the presence of wetlands for county projects.

There is a need to evaluate dredged materials for potential use on county facilities, construction projects, or in wetland restoration, creation and enhancement. Also, planners need to know the water-holding capacity of soils or of amended soils, for example, when reforesting an area or creating a meadow. Soil compaction is another important property. Soils that compact easily can retard infiltration, yet are desirable when designing embankment structures. Some soils erode easily, others do not. There is a considerable amount of disturbed, or man-altered, soils in the County. The current soil survey update includes a study of these soils and an pilot project to assign certain characteristics to these soils. This is a new and emerging field of study, and the soil scientist could provide the information that is available. A soil scientist could assist the Health Department by providing a second opinion regarding drainfield suitability of soils on a given parcel of land. The soil scientist also can provide assistance to the DPWES geotechnical engineers.

The Park Authority has used the soil scientist to provide information to support park planning and development in Annandale and Sully District, as well as infiltration tests for LID demonstration projects in Mt. Vernon, Lee, Springfield, Braddock and Sully Districts. There is a continuing need for these services.

Engineers, consultants, land-use planners, and County staff will use the Soil Survey to determine soil and land characteristics that affect development, such as: percent slope; slope stability and slide potential; soil depth to bedrock; soil depth to seasonal water table; presence of hydric soils; probability of wetlands; surface drainage characteristics; suitability for compaction; bearing capacity and foundation support; erosion factor; shrink-swell potential; suitability for roads; permeability and suitability for infiltration trenches, other infiltration techniques of stormwater management, and ponds; and suitability for septic drain fields. Also, soil type is one component of the County's proposed new method for determining adequate outfall.

Homeowners are interested in both productivity and engineering properties of soils. Soils information also is used by tax assessors, realtors, wetland specialists, lake and pond owners, foresters, nursery operators, owners of small horse farms, park planners and managers, and DPWES stormwater planning and maintenance staff.

There is an essential need to inform and educate County staff and private sector consultants, engineers, landscape architects, soil scientists, realtors, and any interested groups and individuals about the type of information available about soils, when it is needed, how to access it, how to

Ecological Resources #4

Continued

interpret it, and how it should be used. This should be done through training workshops and by creating printed and web-based information and guidance documents.

What, if any, actions should be taken pursuant to EQAC's recommendation?

Consideration should be given to continuing to fund a soil scientist, beginning in FY 2008.

Funding the current soil scientist position within NVSWCD is cost-efficient for the County, as it would not be necessary to create a new County position, provide new office space, or acquire equipment. The soil scientist would continue to work collaboratively with County agencies. The NVSWCD staff already provides support and works with the soil scientist, in addition to answering requests from the industry and general public for soils information.

A stakeholder group of County agencies, in consultation with NRCS and private industry, could help define and prioritize the tasks that a County soil scientist would perform.

Do the actions recommended above have any budget implications for FY 2007? If so, please explain.

There are no additional budget implications for FY 2007. The NVSWCD soil scientist is funded through June 2007. Currently the position is carrying out duties associated with mapping and updating the County Soil Survey, and when requested, provides other services, such as conducting infiltration studies and providing soils-related advice for planning and implementation.

Do the actions recommended above have any longer-range fiscal implications? If so, please explain.

There would be long-range fiscal implications beginning in FY 2008. The Soil Survey update will be completed by the end of FY 2007, and funding for the project will cease.

If the expertise of a soil scientist were to be continued, a funding allocation would be needed in the FY 2008 budget.

Response to 2005 EQAC Recommendation

Recommendation: Wildlife – Deer Management #1

(Pages 220 and 221 of the Annual Report on the Environment)

EQAC Recommendation:

EQAC recommends that the Board of Supervisors continue to implement and monitor the comprehensive deer management program set forth in the Integrated Deer Management Plan adopted in November, 1998 and refined by the County Executive's Deer Management Committee in the summer of 1999 and in subsequent periodic meetings. EQAC strongly supports the following broad goals encompassed in the plan and in the subsequent studies and evaluations:

- Management based on reduction of local deer populations to sustainable levels.
- Management based on a sound ecological approach that emphasizes biodiversity without preferential treatment of particular species.
- Management based on an “in perpetuity” perspective that does not trade long-term interests for short-term gains.
- Protection, restoration, and enhancement of the natural areas and environments that have been subjected to degradation by deer overabundance.

Lead agencies for this response: Police—Animal Services

Coordinating agency(ies) for this response: FCPA; Police—Public Information Office

Please identify a lead agency contact person: Earl L. Hodnett, Wildlife Biologist

Has this recommendation already been addressed, or is it in the process of being addressed? If so, please provide details.

In the summer of 2005, a total of twenty-five parks (sixteen FCPA and nine NVRPA) were selected as potential sites for deer herd reduction. As in past years, each park authority Board of Directors selected the methods which could be used at each site. While managed shotgun hunts are an approved method by both park authorities, parks large enough to safely conduct such hunts are quite limited. As the herds in these larger parks are reduced to desired levels, those parks are removed from the active management category.

While this list has grown annually, the staffing and budget necessary to conduct these activities have both decreased. Presently, there is one dedicated staff position to design, refine and implement the Deer Management Plan. As a result, the gains made since the Plan was implemented have, in many locations, been lost. Based upon the number of dead deer picked up

Deer Management #1 Continued

by VDOT, the County's deer population is approaching a record high which may exceed the 1996 level.

Table 1. List of Parks and Approved Deer Management Methods.
Bold-faced Type Represents Actions taken in the Respective Parks.

Park	Size in Sq. Miles ¹ (640 acres/Mi ²)	Approved Methods
Bull Run Park (NVRPA)	1.36	Archery, Managed Hunts, Sharpshooting
Burke Lake (FCPA)	1.05	Archery, Sharpshooting
Colvin Run S.V. (FCPA)	0.11	Archery, Sharpshooting
Clarks Crossing (FCPA)	0.109	Sharpshooting
Cub Run S.V. (FCPA)	1.29	Archery, Sharpshooting
Difficult Run S.V. (FCPA)	1.35	Archery, Sharpshooting
Ellanor C. Lawrence Park (FCPA)	1.01	Sharpshooting
Fountainhead Park (NVRPA) Occoquan Watershed Properties	1.33	Archery, Sharpshooting
Fox Mill (FCPA)	0.33	Archery, Sharpshooting
Hemlock Overlook (NVRPA)	0.66	Sharpshooting
Huntley Meadows Park (FCPA)	2.23	Archery, Sharpshooting , Managed Hunts
Lake Accotink (FCPA)	0.63	Sharpshooting
Lake Fairfax Park (FCPA)	0.72	Sharpshooting
Laurel Hill (FCPA)	1.25	Sharpshooting
Meadowlark Gardens (NVRPA)	0.15	Archery, Sharpshooting
Occoquan Park (NVRPA)	0.63	Sharpshooting
Pohick Bay (NVRPA)	1.56	Archery, Managed Hunts, Sharpshooting
Riverbend Park (FCPA)	0.63	Sharpshooting
Sandy Run (NVRPA)	0.48	Archery, Sharpshooting
Scotts Run (FCPA)	0.60	Sharpshooting
Sully Plantation (FCPA)	0.28	Sharpshooting

Deer Management #1 Continued

Sully Woodlands (FCPA)	3.59	Managed Hunts, Sharpshooting
Upper Potomac (NVRPA)	0.57	Managed Hunts, Sharpshooting
Wakefield Park (FCPA)	0.46	Sharpshooting
W&OD Trail (at Clarks Crossing) (NVRPA)	.01	Sharpshooting

1 All park sizes represent dry land or suitable deer habitat (lake acreage is subtracted from total park size) and were obtained from the corresponding Park Authority.

Priorities are determined by a number of factors including park size, herd size (or a combination of both), degree of habitat damage, status of herd survey data, estimated staff hours required to reach goals, park operation requirements, and seasonal closure of parks or park facilities.

Indicators support the belief that Bull Run Regional Park, Upper Potomac Regional Park, and Meadowlark Gardens attained the desired herd density goal of 15 - 20 deer per square mile in 2003. Huntley Meadows Park and Ellanor C. Lawrence Park reached this goal shortly thereafter. In the case of Meadowlark Gardens, the density is actually 0 since the park has been encompassed by a deer-proof fence. Bull Run Regional Park and Upper Potomac Regional Park had harbored some of Fairfax County's largest deer herds. These two parks will continue to be monitored in future years and periodic small-scale control measures may be employed as necessary. Once a herd has been reduced to desired herd density, management measures to maintain that level can be smaller and less frequent. A more proactive and aggressive approach could prevent natural areas from being subjected to the level of damage seen in some of the larger parks. This approach is more environmentally sound and would require a smaller investment of time and money.

Sharpshooting is being utilized in both NVRPA and FCPA parks. Sharpshooting will continue through the end of March each year under a state permit. Both sharpshooting and managed hunt techniques continue to be refined and improved making the Fairfax County program one of the best in the nation.

As was first noted during the growing season of 2002, a continued marked improvement has been observed in the understory of the parks which have reached deer herd density goals. Plants that have not been seen growing on the forest floor since the late 1980's are once again growing. Ornamental shrubs now have to be trimmed instead of replaced. While it will take years for the habitat to rebound, these early precursors are quite encouraging. Following an adequate recovery period, assessments can be made of plant species that were extirpated by the years of overbrowsing. This data could then be used to design a restoration program to return the park environments to their earlier state.

What, if any, actions should be taken pursuant to EQAC's recommendation?

Efforts should also be undertaken to identify appropriate local and state resources which could formulate and implement a habitat restoration program for public lands within Fairfax County.

Deer Management #1
Continued

Do the actions recommended above have any budget implications for FY 2007? If so, please explain.

Funding for this program competes with other Police Priorities thus making progress challenging in light of other public safety requirements. However, the control of the deer population is important on many levels including human health and safety, maintaining biodiversity, protecting future generations of forests and maintaining a desirable quality of life for both human and wildlife residents. The need for increased deer management efforts has been recognized, and the list of parks for which deer management efforts have been approved has grown steadily. The effect of increasing demands using limited resources appears, however, to have been a dilution of the overall effort, in that the gains made since the Deer Management Plan was implemented have, in many locations, been lost. The Police Department will continue to supplement activities as needed. However, future funding levels for this program may need to be revisited.

Do the actions recommended above have any longer-range implications? If so, please explain.

The management of the County's deer herd will be an on-going need for years to come, and continued support using existing resources will continue.

Response to 2005 EQAC Recommendation

Recommendation: Wildlife—Deer Management #2

(Page 221 of the Annual Report on the Environment)

EQAC Recommendation:

EQAC strongly commends active participation of the Fairfax County Park Authority in the deer management program in order to provide enhanced stewardship of the parks, golf courses, and other parklands under its care and management. EQAC strongly endorses the joint efforts of the Park Authority and the Animal Services Division of the FCPD to take the program to parks that have not yet been served. Further, EQAC recommends that techniques be employed to concentrate deer in the safest parts of smaller parks when using sharpshooters in order to maximize safety for surrounding neighborhoods.

Lead agencies for this response: FCPA

Coordinating agency(ies) for this response: Police—Animal Services

Please identify a lead agency contact person: Charles Smith, Naturalist III, Natural Resource Management and Protection (703-324-8555; charles.smith@fairfaxcounty.gov)

Has this recommendation already been addressed, or is it in the process of being addressed? If so, please provide details.

The Park Authority continues to be a full partner in the County deer management program and coordinate closely with the County Wildlife Biologist. The Park Authority did expand control efforts during 2005 and for the 2005-6 permit season which had not previously had active measures due to staff and logistic constraints. Generally smaller parks are monitored but are currently not being planned for active management due to problems of controlling human access during management activities and/or the proximity of homes or businesses.

If this recommendation has not been (or is not being) addressed, do you concur with the recommendation? Why or why not?

The Park Authority is addressing this recommendation.

What, if any, actions should be taken pursuant to EQAC's recommendation?

The Park Authority will continue to fully support the deer management program, sponsor and support research and deer population control efforts, and seek ways to expand the program to additional sites.

Deer Management #2 Continued

Do the actions recommended above have any budget implications for FY 2007? If so, please explain.

The need for increased deer management efforts has been recognized, and the list of parks for which deer management efforts have been approved has grown steadily. The effect of increasing demands using limited resources appears, however, to have been a dilution of the overall effort, in that the gains made since the Deer Management Plan was implemented have, in many locations, been lost. Though no new positions have been proposed for FY 2007, future funding levels and staff resource needs for this program may need to be revisited.

Do the actions recommended above have any longer-range fiscal implications? If so, please explain.

Effective deer management will require additional staff and equipment over time. The impact of excessive deer browse cannot be valued fully in natural areas but has a significant influence on the health and composition of plant communities and dependent animal populations. Deer continue to cause significant impacts to park landscaped vegetation, lawns and gardens, impacts to infrastructure such as golf course greens and tees during wet periods and occasional vehicle collisions.

Response to 2005 EQAC Recommendation

Recommendation: Wildlife – Deer Management #3

(Pages 221 of the Annual Report on the Environment)

EQAC Recommendation:

EQAC believes that, while some progress has been made, particularly through the use of archery, the Deer Management Program must address increased attention to the problems associated with owners of small private (mostly residential) properties who are suffering serious impacts from deer and develop means for them legally to exercise effective control measures. EQAC recognizes that this problem is complicated by the overlay of existing State regulations and recommends that our county program officers work closely with State officials to ease these where possible.

Lead agencies for this response: Police—Animal Services

Coordinating agency(ies) for this response: FCPA

Please identify a lead agency contact person: Earl L. Hodnett, Wildlife Biologist

Has this recommendation already been addressed, or is it in the process of being addressed? If so, please provide details.

The Virginia Department of Game & Inland Fisheries (DGIF) will issue permits to property owners experiencing damage from deer or any other wildlife. Many citizens are unaware of this program. Fairfax County and DGIF have increased efforts to inform citizens of this option. Additionally, state code now allows an extended urban archery deer hunting season. Fairfax County has participated in this program since 2002. DGIF then offered selected local jurisdictions across the state a post-season extension to the urban archery option. This regulation expands the deer hunting season in Fairfax County by twelve weeks. These changes in state regulations now offer citizens a wide array of opportunities to manage local deer herds. Since archers harvest the majority of deer taken on private property in the County, this urban season expands the opportunities for property owners and their guests. Starting in the fall of 2005, DGIF adopted a regulation allowing crossbows to be used during legal hunting seasons. Crossbows are very accurate and would allow a person to become proficient without the investment of long hours of practice required with other types of archery equipment. Public education efforts will be expanded to include information on these changes.

Deer management on small private properties has been and will continue to be more challenging than management programs conducted on public lands. At numerous levels, staff provides advisory assistance to property owners. The County Program has used some innovative approaches to this problem. The Animal Services Division issues permits for firearms use to

Deer Management #3 Continued

eligible property owners. The Fairfax County Wildlife Biologist advises property owners of available management options or exclusion techniques. Assistance has been given to private property owners in the design of safe and effective hunt plans.

It has become routine procedure to inform citizens of all existing options allowed under the law. This information is provided in all public speaking engagements as well as telephone and e-mail contacts. The County Deer Management web page provides information about ways private property owners can cope with deer problems.

While a number of citizens have offered the use of their property for sharpshooting activities, this expansion of the program has not yet been recommended by staff nor approved by the BOS. Such an expansion would further dilute the existing manpower and material resources of the program. Without additional resource allocation, a recommendation to expand sharpshooting onto private properties would be premature until all available public lands have been adequately treated.

Animal Services and FCPA continue to perform outreach with private landowners who control property adjacent to or adjoining public lands to develop and coordinate deer management programs. Furthermore, FCPA has a letter explaining the legal issues related to game retrieval from another landowner's property, and how retrieval of wounded animals from Park Authority property may be facilitated.

Animal Services has worked closely with DGIF to identify the unique needs of private landowners in urban areas. Efforts to adapt regulations and state code sections to further address problems faced by these landowners are ongoing. DGIF has organized committees across the state to review and update the State Deer Management Plan. The Fairfax County Wildlife Biologist has been serving as member of the committee for this region. The issue of deer control on private suburban properties has been one of the agenda items.

What, if any, actions should be taken pursuant to EQAC's recommendation?

Additional efforts, as possible, will be made to expand the public education and outreach components of the Deer Management Program. This is particularly important for the provision of new information and legal updates to citizens. The Police Department will continue to support this endeavor in light of competing demands for public safety.

Do the actions recommended above have any budget implications for FY 2007? If so, please explain.

Funding for this program competes with other police priorities, thus making progress challenging in light of other public safety requirements. The control of the deer population is important on many levels including human health and safety, maintaining biodiversity, protecting future generations of forests and maintaining a desirable quality of life for both human and wildlife residents. The Police Department will continue to supplement activities as needed.

Deer Management #3
Continued

Do the actions recommended above have any longer-range implications? If so, please explain.

The Police Department will continue to supplement activities as needed, which may include a future request for an Assistant Wildlife Biologist.

Response to 2005 EQAC Recommendation

Recommendation: Wildlife – Deer Management #4

(Page 221 of the Annual Report on the Environment)

EQAC Recommendation:

EQAC believes that the management program must continue to accomplish the following key objectives:

- Immediate and sustained measures for reduction of the deer population in order to return the size of the local herds to levels consistent with the long term carrying capacity of their particular local habitats.
- Ongoing monitoring and evaluation of new methods for maintaining population limits over the long term, such as immunocontraception and other experimental methods.
- Consideration of development in the county and its effects on ecosystem health and biodiversity as these relate to deer management as well as to the quality of life generally.

Lead agencies for this response: Police—Animal Services

Coordinating agency(ies) for this response: FCPA; Police – Public Information Office

Please identify a lead agency contact person: Earl L. Hodnett, Wildlife Biologist

Has this recommendation already been addressed, or is it in the process of being addressed? If so, please provide details.

The management program continues to reduce local herds to levels consistent with the long-term carrying capacity of remaining habitats. Managed hunts, sharpshooting and private/public partnerships are combined to apply the necessary control pressure to first stabilize and then reduce deer herds. Cooperative efforts have proven to be very successful in the reduction of herds on a home range scale. Progress has been made in formulating cooperative agreements between federal, state and regional landholders for home range scale management of deer.

Fairfax County continues to monitor developments and progress of non-lethal methods of deer herd control such as immunocontraception. Recent research has demonstrated a new method which requires only a single dose and renders fallow deer sterile for at least three years. While this product must undergo further study and regulation approvals, it may be a viable technique for consideration for use in Fairfax County. Fairfax County remains ready to cooperate with any

Deer Management #4 Continued

university or other research organization seeking to develop such techniques as would be applicable in the control of a free ranging herd.

It is commonly recognized that development of natural areas exacerbates the problems associated with a growing deer herd. This typically is the result of the rapid development of Fairfax County. Development outside the County boundaries (and control) also has an effect on biodiversity and deer populations within Fairfax County. Heavy development in Loudoun County appears to have pushed additional deer into northern Fairfax County.

Current data collection targets deer/automobile crashes and is considered in control and management planning. The Wildlife Biologist is working in cooperation with other agencies to identify additional means of data collection to address ecosystem health and biodiversity issues. The collection of this additional data must be a multi-agency partnership to effectively evaluate impacts on the quality of life. The Wildlife Biologist will actively work with our established partners toward this goal.

What, if any, actions should be taken pursuant to EQAC's recommendation?

The measurement of deer herd densities should continue, as should ongoing control and management efforts.

The Wildlife Biologist participates in a Council of Governments sub-committee formed to look at the issue of highways and wildlife. One of the products of this effort will be a regional handbook of design and retrofit techniques for roads and highway development. A regional public service announcement video is also expected to be provided to COG member jurisdictions. Both of these products will be made available to local governments in the coming months.

Further actions should be taken to identify and coordinate with Fairfax County, state, and private sector entities involved in the planning and development process. Better collection and utilization of existing or new data in this process should be a shared goal.

Do the actions recommended above have any budget implications for FY 2007? If so, please explain.

Funding for this program competes with other police priorities, thus making progress challenging in light of other public safety requirements. The control of the deer population is important on many levels including human health and safety, maintaining biodiversity, protecting future generations of forests and maintaining a desirable quality of life for both human and wildlife residents. The Police Department will continue to supplement activities as needed.

Deer Management #4
Continued

Do the actions recommended above have any longer-range implications? If so, please explain.

The Police Department will continue to supplement activities as needed, which may include a future request for an Assistant Wildlife Biologist.

Response to 2005 EQAC Recommendation

Recommendation: Wildlife – Deer Management #5

(Page 221 of the Annual Report on the Environment)

EQAC Recommendation:

Since public acceptance of, and participation in, deer management programs is more easily achieved when there is full public understanding of the problem, the available management options, and their costs and other consequences, EQAC strongly recommends that the Board of Supervisors continue to provide for a vigorous program of public education as is now being done by the Animal Services Division and on the county's Web site.

Lead agencies for this response: Police—Animal Services

Coordinating agency(ies) for this response: Police – Public Information Office

Please identify a lead agency contact person: Earl L. Hodnett, Wildlife Biologist

Has this recommendation already been addressed, or is it in the process of being addressed? If so, please provide details.

Educational efforts have been underway since the inception of the Fairfax County Integrated Deer Management Plan. While a wide variety of mediums for information dispersal have been used, additional means are being explored. This will include a better utilization of the County's cable TV capabilities. The Fairfax County Wildlife Biologist has worked with Channel 16 to produce three one half hour wildlife programs. The programs entitled *Fairfax County's Wild Side* highlight wildlife issues. One program was entirely dedicated to the white-tailed deer. Also under consideration are one minute spots which would cover a variety of wildlife topics and run between other program slots.

Publications available in the Fairfax County Library system will be updated and expanded annually. These resources coupled with the County Deer Management page on the County's Web site will provide citizens with readily available reference materials.

Celebrate Fairfax provides an opportunity to reach a large number of County citizens. An interactive display on wildlife concerns was again part of the Public Safety display. These large events are perfect venues for wildlife displays. New portable displays have been developed for use at large events such as Celebrate Fairfax as well as at libraries and schools. The Deer Management in Fairfax County brochure has been printed and distributed to points of contact throughout the County. This brochure is due to be updated as soon as resources permit.

When the County conducts managed deer hunts, staff is always available to answer questions from either citizens or the media. While education is a dynamic and continual component of the Fairfax County Integrated Deer Management Plan, some examples of educational efforts during the last year included:

Deer Management #5 Continued

- Channel 16's County Magazine annually runs a segment about deer and the County's Deer Management Program.
- The Police Department Public Information Office again produced a news release on safe driving tips to heighten public awareness of the increased hazard that deer pose during the fall rut.
- The Wildlife Biologist again presented programs and had a display on white-tailed deer at the Providence District Environmental Workshop. This has developed into an annual event benefiting citizens of Providence District.
- The Wildlife Biologist has utilized the well-established Citizens Advisory Committee program as a means of meeting with local communities to answer citizen wildlife concerns and to disseminate information about the County's wildlife programs.
- Staff education is an important facet of the program. Various meetings have been held to ensure that staff is aware of the details of the Deer Management Program and are better able to respond to citizen inquiries. Staff briefings, fact sheets and broadcast e-mail have been utilized to keep staff abreast of wildlife issues and developments. Such information has been presented to the Board of Supervisors staffs, the Police Department Public Information Office, the Office of Public Affairs and the Fairfax County Park Authority park managers.
- Fairfax County has effectively used the Internet by posting updates of information on deer. Deer control efforts and deer-related human safety issues are also covered and updated as new information becomes available.
- Business style cards advertising the deer management page on the County's Web site have been printed for distribution at events and meetings.

The challenge of educating a large, diverse and mobile population is indeed daunting. Staff continues to seek the development of new methods to address this need.

What, if any, actions should be taken pursuant to EQAC's recommendation?

The Police Department will continue to supplement activities as needed.

Do the actions recommended above have any budget implications for FY 2007? If so, please explain.

Additional staffing may be requested in the future. The Police Department will continue to support Deer Management and outreach through existing resources.

Deer Management #5
Continued

Do the actions recommended above have any longer-range implications? If so, please explain.

An additional position for an Assistant Wildlife Biologist may be required in the future.

Response to 2005 EQAC Recommendation

Recommendation: Wildlife – Deer Management #6

(Page 221 and 222 of the Annual Report on the Environment)

EQAC Recommendation:

EQAC endorses ongoing public input into the plan, including surveys of public opinion and the inclusion of major stakeholders (home owners, environmental preservationists, public safety experts, wildlife biologists, public health experts, sport hunting groups, animal rights groups, etc.) in the continued refinement and implementation of the plan. EQAC fully supports continuation of both the input of a broad range of views and the use of spokespersons, such as the County Wildlife Biologist, who can articulate program goals and the ongoing management approach to the varied community groups and viewpoints.

Lead agencies for this response: Police—Animal Services

Coordinating agency(ies) for this response: FCPA; Police – Public Information Office

Please identify a lead agency contact person: Earl L. Hodnett, Wildlife Biologist

Has this recommendation already been addressed, or is it in the process of being addressed? If so, please provide details.

The County web page devoted to deer management issues (<http://www.co.fairfax.va.us/comm/deer/deermgt.htm>) continues to be updated and expanded. This site provides a wealth of information to citizens about the issue and the efforts being undertaken to deal with the associated problems. Citizens are able to send e-mail through this site to voice their opinions or to ask questions.

Input is also received from citizens via telephone, e-mail or conversations at meetings of special interest groups, civic associations, professional conferences, garden clubs or other public gatherings. Presentations about deer issues and the County's plan of response are routinely provided to citizens at various meetings. Such meetings as community association meetings, Police Department Citizen Advisory Committee meetings, Police Department Citizen's Police Academy sessions and the Animal Services Advisory Commission are opportunities for information exchange and citizen input. All of these sources are utilized in the assessment and improvement of the Program.

FCPA has participated in developing the Fairfax County web pages related to the deer management plan, has featured deer information in Nature Center programs and frequently fields questions from citizens regarding the plan.

Deer Management #6
Continued

What, if any, actions should be taken pursuant to EQAC's recommendation?

Staff recognizes the importance and value of public input, including a broad range of views, and has and will continue to seek new venues and methods to both seek input and provide related information to citizens.

Do the actions recommended above have any budget implications for FY 2007? If so, please explain.

Funding for this program competes with other police priorities, thus making progress challenging in light of other public safety requirements. The control of the deer population is important on many levels including human health and safety, maintaining biodiversity, protecting future generations of forests and maintaining a desirable quality of life for both human and wildlife residents. The Police Department will continue to supplement activities as needed.

Do the actions recommended above have any longer-range implications? If so, please explain.

The Deer Management Committee and/or other means for collection of community input and discussion should continue, and must be supported.

Response to 2005 EQAC Recommendation

Recommendation: Wildlife – Geese Management #1

(Page 232 of the Annual Report on the Environment)

EQAC Recommendation:

EQAC finds the current programs are effective and should be continued and, where feasible, expanded.

Lead agencies for this response: Police—Animal Services

Coordinating agency(ies) for this response: Police – Public Information Office

Please identify a lead agency contact person: Earl L. Hodnett, Wildlife Biologist

Has this recommendation already been addressed, or is it in the process of being addressed? If so, please provide details.

The Animal Services Division concurs with EQAC's recommendation and intends to continue and expand the current programs. As the number of volunteers/cooperators increases, the effectiveness of the addling program should proportionately increase. Enhanced partnerships with GeesePeace and FCPA have been beneficial in the past. However, GeesePeace personnel notified the Animal Services Division that they would be unable to continue the program partnership with Fairfax County. They have chosen to utilize their resources to promote such programs across the nation. While the Animal Services Division desires to continue a goose management program, it is unclear at this time what the new program will encompass.

What, if any, actions should be taken pursuant to EQAC's recommendation?

A new program will be developed and staff will seek ways and means to expand efforts.

However, although public/private partnerships should continue and be expanded, there will be a need for a staff member who could devote time to this program throughout the year. A data base of cooperating land owners as well as trained volunteers needs to be developed and maintained if the program is to produce the desired results. An Assistant Wildlife Biologist position would benefit and enhance this program as well. A successful program requires community education and outreach, volunteer coordination, data collection and analysis, outreach and coordination with other local, state, and federal agencies.

Geese Management #1
Continued

Do the actions recommended above have any budget implications for FY 2007? If so, please explain.

Funding for this program competes with other police priorities, thus making progress challenging in light of other public safety requirements. The control of the Geese population is important on many levels including human health and safety and maintaining a desirable quality of life for both human and wildlife residents.

Do the actions recommended above have any longer-range implications? If so, please explain.

The Police Department will continue to supplement activities as needed, which may include a future request for an Assistant Wildlife Biologist.

Response to 2005 EQAC Recommendation

Recommendation: Wildlife – Geese Management #2

(Page 232 of the Annual Report on the Environment)

EQAC Recommendation:

EQAC recommends that the current programs be replicated in many other areas of the county by training additional citizens and homeowner groups in goose population stabilization methodology.

Lead agencies for this response: Police—Animal Services

Coordinating agency(ies) for this response: Police – Public Information Office

Please identify a lead agency contact person: Earl L. Hodnett, Wildlife Biologist

Has this recommendation already been addressed, or is it in the process of being addressed? If so, please provide details.

In the past, the Fairfax County Wildlife Biologist in association with GeesePeace conducted a series of volunteer training sessions prior to the spring nesting season each year. A new program will require a fresh look at the mechanics of this process. Year-round efforts must be undertaken to identify and recruit property owners who will permit addling of Canada goose nests located on their property.

At the January 27, 2003 Board of Supervisors meeting, OPA was directed to assist in providing public notice of volunteer training sessions for this program.

What, if any, actions should be taken pursuant to EQAC's recommendation?

Subject to the design of a new program, efforts will be directed to expand the number of trained volunteers and of cooperating property owners. A successful program requires community education and outreach, volunteer coordination, data collection and analysis, outreach and coordination with other agencies, including local, state, and federal.

Do the actions recommended above have any budget implications for FY 2007? If so, please explain.

Additional staffing may be requested in the future. The Police Department will continue to support Geese Management and outreach through existing resources.

Geese Management #2
Continued

Do the actions recommended above have any longer-range implications? If so, please explain.

An additional position for an Assistant Wildlife Biologist may be requested in the future.

Response to 2005 EQAC Recommendation

Recommendation: Wildlife – Geese Management #3

(Page 232 of the Annual Report on the Environment)

EQAC Recommendation:

EQAC recommends enhanced public education outreach to sensitize all Fairfax County residents and owners of nonresidential properties to the pollution problems caused by geese and the programs available for addressing them.

Lead agencies for this response: Police—Animal Services

Coordinating agency(ies) for this response: Police – Public Information Office

Please identify a lead agency contact person: Earl L. Hodnett, Wildlife Biologist

Has this recommendation already been addressed, or is it in the process of being addressed? If so, please provide details.

The Animal Services Division will be working in cooperation with state and federal officials to gather data on the effects of resident goose populations upon local tidal marshlands in Fairfax County. This information will be provided to the public through existing methods. The Division has worked with Channel 16 to produce programming which covers Canada geese and the issues related to them.

Display units have been purchased for use in developing traveling displays addressing various wildlife issues. These displays can be used as "backdrops" for presentations to citizen groups or as stand-alone displays at libraries and schools.

What, if any, actions should be taken pursuant to EQAC's recommendation?

The Animal Services Division concurs with EQAC's recognition of the need for expanded public education on this topic. This is a common component of all the wildlife programs and issues the County faces now and will face in future years. The addition of an Assistant Wildlife Biologist would greatly enhance the outreach capabilities of the Geese Management Program.

Do the actions recommended above have any budget implications for FY 2007? If so, please explain.

Current Animal Services Wildlife Section funding and staffing will continue to be supplemented by police resources.

Geese Management #3
Continued

Do the actions recommended above have any longer-range implications? If so, please explain.

An additional position for an Assistant Wildlife Biologist may be requested in the future.

Response to 2005 EQAC Recommendation

Recommendation: Wildlife – Geese Management #4

(Page 232 of the Annual Report on the Environment)

EQAC Recommendation:

EQAC recommends enhanced public education outreach to acquaint all Fairfax County residents with the role excessive goose populations play in destruction of our marshland habitats.

Lead agencies for this response: Police—Animal Services

Coordinating agency(ies) for this response: Police – Public Information Office

Please identify a lead agency contact person: Earl L. Hodnett, Wildlife Biologist

Has this recommendation already been addressed, or is it in the process of being addressed? If so, please provide details.

The Animal Services Division is presently developing a goose management program to replace the program formally known as GeesePeace. The Fairfax County Wildlife Biologist provides information about all available options and programs to property owners through telephone and e-mail contacts. A new website will be developed to better convey current information and available management options.

Previously, the Office of Public Affairs has assisted with the outreach to County residents, by sending a news release to the media announcing the geese stabilization program. This news release sought two distinct audiences. It solicited volunteers to be trained to addle eggs and encouraged residents to notify GeesePeace via a property owner's consent form if they owned a property with a goose population where addling could be performed. This information was also included in the Public Affairs publication News to Use which is sent to nearly 1700 County homeowners and citizens associations that in turn may use the information in their newsletters. This outreach effort will be reformatted to describe the new program.

Recent programming development with Channel 16 should provide an excellent educational opportunity. In addition to a program dedicated to Canada geese in Fairfax County, there may be the possibility of developing short (30 second - 1 minute) public safety announcements which would air between other programming. These short segments could be utilized to address this or any other wildlife issue.

The Facilities Management Division did an excellent job on the production of a County Web site covering the Herrity Building Habitat Modification Project.

Geese Management #4
Continued

What, if any, actions should be taken pursuant to EQAC's recommendation?

An additional staff position, an Assistant Wildlife Biologist, would be beneficial and afford the resources necessary to expand the educational outreach efforts of the Animal Services Division. Expansion of the Division's information on the County's Web site to cover more wildlife topics would be a top priority. It would also double the ability to accommodate requests for presentations and programming.

Do the actions recommended above have any budget implications for FY 2007? If so, please explain.

Current funding will be supported as necessary with existing police resources.

Do the actions recommended above have any longer-range implications? If so, please explain.

An additional position for an Assistant Wildlife Biologist may be requested in the future.

Response to 2005 EQAC Recommendation

Recommendation: Wildlife – Wildlife Borne Diseases #1

(Page 240 of the Annual Report on the Environment)

EQAC Recommendation:

EQAC recommends that the Board of Supervisors provide continued active support to the reorganized Stream Monitoring Program in which the Stream Protection Strategies Program of the DPWES will perform sample collection and field testing and the Health Department will perform laboratory testing and analysis functions. EQAC recommends that county staff ensure the posting of advisories on the county Web site when polluted waters are identified. EQAC further recommends that the Board of Supervisors monitor the program through periodic reports to its Environment Committee.

Lead agencies for this response: DPWES (SWPD)

Coordinating agency(ies) for this response: HEALTH; OPA

Please identify a lead agency contact person: Danielle Wynne

Has this recommendation already been addressed, or is it in the process of being addressed? If so, please provide details.

As recommended by the EPA, Fairfax County has completed its bacteriological monitoring transfer from using fecal coliform to *E. coli* as an indicator of possible fecal contamination. The basis behind this change stems from the 1986 EPA findings that *E. coli* exhibits a stronger correlation to swimming borne illnesses for humans than fecal coliform. Thus by changing indicators, we are able to make better recommendations regarding the safety of our water for recreational uses. In addition to testing for *E. coli* levels, we continue to test for total phosphorous, nitrate, and nitrogen levels.

Additionally, in 2005 the Health Department updated its procedure to determine *E. coli* levels from the Modified *E. coli* method which was a membrane filter technique, to the Colilert test by IDEXX. This new testing method increases the precision of the results and reduces the amount of human based error.

2004 bacteria sampling year results may be found in the 2005 Annual Report on Fairfax County's Streams (<http://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/dpwes/stormwater/streams/streamreports.htm>). Hard copies of this report may be obtained by contacting the Stormwater Planning Division. Copies of the completed report were given to the members of the Fairfax County Board of Supervisors

After review of the data collected through the bacteriological program, staff supports the Health Department's Water Quality Statement on the Recreational Use of County Stream, which states: *"In summary, any open, unprotected body of water is subject to pollution from indiscriminate*

Wildlife Borne Diseases #1

Continued

dumping of litter and waste products, sewer line breaks and contamination from runoff pesticides, herbicides, and waste from domestic and wildlife animals. Therefore, the use of streams for contact recreational purposes, such as swimming, wading, etc., which could cause ingestion of stream water or possible contamination of an open wound by stream water, should be avoided."

Other actions for posting advisories and information are explained under the response for EQAC's Water Resources #6 recommendation.

News releases for local and regional newspapers on information related to the annual report and stream advisories will be prepared by the county's communication staff. The news release will be posted on the county's Web site, included in News to Use (an email newsletter sent to county residents) and included in Newslink (a daily e-mail newsletter sent to all county employees).

If this recommendation has not been (or is not being) addressed, do you concur with the recommendation? Why or why not?

DPWES-Stormwater Planning Division staff have integrated results from all biological monitoring programs into the 2005 Annual Report on Fairfax County Stream's as well the annual NPDES report. The Board of Supervisors received copies of both of these reports.

What, if any, actions should be taken pursuant to EQAC's recommendation?

The Fairfax County Health Department Water Quality Statement for the Recreational Use of County Streams should be incorporated into the stormwater and watershed outreach and education programs. Coordination among various agencies, including DPWES, Health Department, NVSWCD, OPA, Fairfax County Park Authority and others will ensure that materials, (i.e. brochures, fliers, and notices), are distributed in highly visible areas and have a consistent message and a comprehensive scope.

As was found through the recent USGS study on Accotink Creek, identifying the exact source of fecal contamination in our waterways requires a coordinated multi-agency effort and the use of techniques to identify multiple human source tracers. Agencies such as Stormwater Planning, Health Department, Maintenance and Stormwater Management, and Waste Water Management will continue to work closely to locate and correct probable contaminations.

Do the actions recommended above have any budget implications for FY 2007? If so, please explain.

The bacteriological monitoring program and outreach and education initiatives will be funded through the one cent on the real estate tax dedication. The one cent of the real estate tax is currently in the county executive's proposed budget.

Wildlife Borne Diseases #1
Continued

Do the actions recommended above have any longer-range fiscal implications? If so, please explain.

The continued real estate tax dedication will provide program stability, accommodate growth, and provide continuity across fiscal years.

Response to 2005 EQAC Recommendation

Recommendation: Wildlife – Wildlife Borne Diseases #2

(Page 240 of the Annual Report on the Environment)

EQAC Recommendation:

EQAC recommends that the Health Department continue and enhance its excellent public education programs.

LEAD AGENCY: Health

COORDINATING AGENCY/IES: OPA

Please identify a lead agency contact person: Glenn Smith

Has this recommendation already been addressed, or is it in the process of being addressed? If so, please provide details.

This recommendation is continuing to be implemented and enhanced as EQAC has recommended. The Health Department has prepared, produced, and distributed an 18-month calendar that was full of bright and colorful creative graphics for each month, many humorous in nature. But more notable than the graphics were the complementary captions, facts, figures, important dates, and helpful reminders of things for readers to do in daily life to manage mosquitoes and protect themselves from West Nile virus. Important behaviors such as cleaning gutters, emptying bird baths, filling depressions in the yard, and wearing insect repellent were strategically stressed throughout the calendar on dates when the average resident is home or is likely to be outdoors.

During the summer of FY2005-FY2006, the WNV program distributed over 175,000 pieces of educational information material to members of the community. At present the WNV program is creating new documents. Fairfax County is working collaboratively with other jurisdictions and with the Council of Governments and chairs the Mosquito Borne Pathogens Committee.

If this recommendation has not been (or is not being) addressed, do you concur with the recommendation? Why or why not?

The Health Department concurs and supports the EQAC recommendation as it is one of the main methods for approaching disease prevention.

What, if any, actions should be taken pursuant to EQAC's recommendation?

No new actions need be taken pursuant to EQAC's recommendation.

Wildlife Borne Diseases #2
Continued

Do the actions recommended above have any budget implications for FY 2006? If so, please explain.

Funding for the FY2007 WNV Program has been established.

Do the actions recommended above have any longer-range fiscal implications? If so, please explain.

Continued budget funding for the Disease Carrying Insect Program.

Response to 2005 EQAC Recommendation

Recommendation: Wildlife—Wildlife Borne Diseases #3

(Page 240 of the Annual Report on the Environment)

EQAC Recommendation:

EQAC recommends that the Police Department continue its animal control program and, in conjunction with the Health Department, expand public education initiatives in key areas, such as control of rabies and of wildlife contributing to pollution of surface waters.

Lead agencies for this response: Police—Animal Services

Coordinating agency(ies) for this response: Health; Police—Public Information Office

Please identify a lead agency contact person: Earl L. Hodnett, Wildlife Biologist

Has this recommendation already been addressed, or is it in the process of being addressed? If so, please provide details.

The Animal Services Division routinely provides the public with information on rabies and other wildlife borne diseases. Rabies is addressed on the Animal Services webpage at: www.fairfaxcounty.gov/ps/ac/rabfacts.htm. There is also a link to the Health Department's page which describes the former oral rabies vaccine program. In addition, the Animal Services Division conducts rabies vaccination clinics every other month. Rabies is also addressed in the Division's brochure entitled Your Pets and the Law.

The Health Department has an excellent brochure entitled Rabies and Animal Bites; What You Should Know and What You Should Do. This brochure is currently under review for possible updates. The Animal Services Division and the Health Department work very closely on all potential rabies exposure cases.

Both the Health Department and the Animal Services Division participate in the Animal Control Regional Roundtable. This is a group compiled of representatives from the animal control departments and health departments of various jurisdictions throughout the region. This group has chosen to expand the topics of discussion beyond rabies to include all wildlife diseases.

The Fairfax County Wildlife Biologist established an e-mail group for rapid conveyance of wildlife disease information. This group includes the DGIF, the Wildlife Biologist, the Animal Control Regional Roundtable, the Animal Services Division Commander, FCPA, and the Health Department. As potential issues are identified, informational updates are provided to the OPA, the Police Department's PIO, the County Executive, and the Board of Supervisors. If warranted, information is then disseminated to the public through normal means.

The staff of the Animal Services Division routinely disseminates current wildlife disease information and includes such information in most public presentations and other points of contact. One program produced by Channel 16 in cooperation with the Animal Services Division was devoted to educating the public about Canada geese and the associated health and pollution concerns.

Wildlife Borne Diseases #3

Continued

What, if any, actions should be taken pursuant to EQAC's recommendation?

The Animal Services Division, the Wildlife Biologist, and the Health Department will continue to work closely with other County staff, as well as state and federal agencies, to ensure early identification of potential wildlife disease issues. This information will then be provided to the public in the most expeditious way. An Assistant Wildlife Biologist position would benefit and enhance this program. A successful program requires community education and outreach, volunteer coordination, data collection and analysis, outreach and coordination with other agencies, including local, state, and federal.

Do the actions recommended above have any budget implications for FY 2007? If so, please explain.

Additional staffing may be requested in the future. The Police Department will continue to support this program through existing resources.

Do the actions recommended above have any longer-range implications? If so, please explain.

Current Animal Services Wildlife Section funding and staffing resources need to be re-evaluated in order to implement an ever-growing list of desired programs. An additional position would require a long-term funding commitment.

Response to 2005 EQAC Recommendation

Recommendation: Wildlife – Wildlife Borne Diseases #4

(Page 240 of the Annual Report on the Environment)

EQAC Recommendation:

EQAC recommends that the Board of Supervisors provide active support to the program for Disease Carrying Insects program that assesses the epidemiology and abatement of insect vector-borne diseases such as West Nile Virus. EQAC recommends that the Board of Supervisors monitor this program through periodic reports to its Environment Committee by county staff.

LEAD AGENCY: Health

COORDINATING AGENCY/IES: None

Please identify a lead agency contact person: Glenn Smith

Has this recommendation already been addressed, or is it in the process of being addressed? If so, please provide details.

This recommendation has been addressed.

The Board of Supervisors has provided and continues to provide support for the Disease Carrying Insect Program that addresses the epidemiology and abatement of insect vector-borne diseases such as WNV. The Health Department, through the Mosquito Surveillance and Management Subcommittee (MSMS), a subcommittee of the Environmental Coordinating Committee, provides periodic reports of the program's progress. The Health Department informs the Board of Supervisors annually, in a more direct manner, through a Progress Report and Plan of Action for the subsequent year.

If this recommendation has not been (or is not being) addressed, do you concur with the recommendation? Why or why not?

What, if any, actions should be taken pursuant to EQAC's recommendation?

Compliance with the EQAC recommendation requires no new action need be taken.

Do the actions recommended above have any budget implications for FY 2007? If so, please explain.

Funding for the Disease Carrying Insect Program has been established for FY2007.

Wildlife Borne Diseases #4
Continued

Do the actions recommended above have any longer-range fiscal implications? If so, please explain.

Continued budget funding for the Disease Carrying Insect Program.

Response to 2005 EQAC Recommendation

Recommendation: Noise #1

(Page 254 of the Annual Report on the Environment)

EQAC Recommendation:

Continue to support airport noise monitoring (day and night) and compatible land use planning near airports in the county. Consistent with existing policy, proposals for rezonings for residential development should not be supported in areas with projected noise impacts of DNL 60 dBA or greater.

Lead agencies for this response: DPZ (Planning Division)

Coordinating agency(ies) for this response: None

Please identify a lead agency contact person: Noel Kaplan

Has this recommendation already been addressed, or is it in the process of being addressed? If so, please provide details.

This recommendation is similar to a recommendation issued by EQAC in the 2004 Annual Report on the Environment. Therefore, the staff response is similar. As noted in last year's response, this recommendation has been addressed.

Fairfax County's Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Ordinance have long supported airport noise compatible planning in the area near Washington Dulles International Airport. Both the Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Ordinance reference the most recent airport noise contour projections for the airport that have been provided by the Metropolitan Washington Airports Authority; the contours were last updated in 1997, with the 65 decibel noise contour (expressed as DNL 65 dBA, and based on a worst-case overlay of several projections provided by MWAA) defining the boundary of the Airport Noise Impact Overlay District of the Zoning Ordinance, and with the long-term projected DNL 60 dBA contour defining the extent of the Dulles Airport Noise Impact Area that is referenced in the Comprehensive Plan. Comprehensive Plan policy recommends against new residential development inside the DNL 60 dBA noise contour; the effect has been to preclude residential rezonings inside this contour. Since the most recent set of noise contours for Washington Dulles International Airport were adopted in 1997, the Board of Supervisors has not approved any rezoning that would have resulted in residential development inside the DNL 60 dBA contour.

Neither existing nor projected airport noise impacts above DNL 60 dBA have been projected in Fairfax County for operations at Ronald Reagan Washington National Airport. Operations at Davison U.S. Army Airfield may potentially affect a small area off of Fort Belvoir to the north of the airfield in an area that is largely industrial in character. Comprehensive Plan policy regarding new residential development inside the projected DNL 60 dBA impact area will be a consideration if and when any new residential zoning requests are pursued in this area.

Noise #1
Continued

If this recommendation has not been (or is not being) addressed, do you concur with the recommendation? Why or why not?

We concur with the recommendation and feel that it is being addressed.

What, if any, actions should be taken pursuant to EQAC's recommendation?

Airport noise contour projections associated with Washington Dulles International Airport should be kept current in the Zoning Ordinance and Comprehensive Plan as updated projections are issued by MWAA.

Do the actions recommended above have any budget implications for FY 2007? If so, please explain.

No.

Do the actions recommended above have any longer-range fiscal implications? If so, please explain.

No.

Response to 2005 EQAC Recommendation

Recommendation: Noise #2

(Page 254 of the Annual Report on the Environment)

EQAC Recommendation:

Develop and distribute materials to educate the public on airport noise issues, including airport noise contours, noise compatible planning and regulation, noise changes that may result from new construction and changes in flight frequencies, and noise complaint procedures. Incorporate these educational materials into the county's overall environmental educational efforts by encouraging all science and environmental teachers to include noise and its implications into their lesson plans.

Lead agencies for this response: DPZ (Planning Division)

Coordinating agency(ies) for this response: OPA

Please identify a lead agency contact person: Noel Kaplan

Has this recommendation already been addressed, or is it in the process of being addressed? If so, please provide details.

With respect to public school lesson plans, the following objective is part of the ninth grade health curriculum of the Fairfax County Public Schools:

"The student will be able to identify different types of noise pollution and their effects on one's health. The students will be able to describe various ways to protect oneself from noise pollution."

The health curriculum has a one-lesson focus on noise pollution. Different types of airport noise are not specifically discussed; however, jet noise is mentioned in a discussion that compares decibel levels. In addition, a broader focus on sound has been incorporated into physical science and physics classes, and the Active Physics high school course has a lesson on the effects of noise. The focus of this lesson, though, is on the evaluation of the safety of exposure to noise at a rock concert; aircraft noise exposure is not addressed specifically.

The portion of the recommendation that addresses public education in general is identical to a recommendation from the 2004 EQAC Annual Report on the Environment. Because the status of this issue is the same as it was last year, last year's response remains valid and is therefore incorporated into this year's response:

This component of the recommendation has not been addressed and is not in progress, although airport noise contour projections associated with Washington Dulles International Airport are provided in the Area III volume of the county's Comprehensive Plan, along with guidance relating these contour projections to county policy regarding land use compatibility. The last major county effort regarding airport noise-related outreach occurred in conjunction with the 1997 revisions to the county's adopted noise contours (both in the Zoning Ordinance and Comprehensive Plan) and related Comprehensive Plan policy. A legal notice regarding the

Noise #2

Continued

Zoning Ordinance and Comprehensive Plan amendments associated with the revised noise contours, along with a “frequently asked questions”-type brochure describing basic airport noise concepts and terms as well as the proposed policy and regulatory changes, was mailed to over 2,000 property owners in the area near Dulles Airport. While it is recognized that the scope of this effort differed from the scope of EQAC’s proposed public education effort (the focus was on noise contours and noise compatible planning and not airport operational procedures and noise complaints), there was minimal public interest in these matters based on the relative lack of inquiries received in response to the mailings. There are currently no plans for a broad outreach/educational effort at this time.

If this recommendation has not been (or is not being) addressed, do you concur with the recommendation? Why or why not?

Pursuit of EQAC’s recommended educational efforts would be desirable but would need to be considered in terms of overall resources available for this and other demands on staff resources. Staff agrees that there is merit in enhancing public education efforts, particularly in light of the completion of the Environmental Impact Statement process for two new runways at Washington Dulles International Airport and the pending construction of the first of these new runways. However, the extent of such an effort needs to consider broader demands on staff resources.

EQAC’s recommendation regarding the public school curriculum has been forwarded to the appropriate staff within Fairfax County Public Schools for their information.

What, if any, actions should be taken pursuant to EQAC’s recommendation?

An extensive education campaign is not recommended at this time. However, it would be appropriate to incorporate basic airport noise information onto the county’s Web site, with links provided to the Metropolitan Washington Airports Authority Web site and other related sites. No progress has been made on this issue over the last year. However, EQAC’s reiteration of this recommendation has caused staff to initiate efforts to incorporate airport noise information into the Environment section of the county’s Web site.

Do the actions recommended above have any budget implications for FY 2007? If so, please explain.

Any efforts to develop public information, whether they are related to the addition of information to the county’s Web site or to a broader educational campaign, will have resource implications and will need to be staffed within the context of other staff demands. However, staff is not recommending any additional funding for this effort at this time. Staff instead recommends coordination among applicable agencies to identify appropriate additions to the county’s Web site.

Do the actions recommended above have any longer-range fiscal implications? If so, please explain.

No long term implications are anticipated.

Response to 2005 EQAC Recommendation

Recommendation: Noise #3

(Page 254 of the Annual Report on the Environment)

EQAC Recommendation:

Encourage the use of opportunities provided by the Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) that allow for third party contributions to noise barrier construction when the VDOT cost criteria preclude VDOT's construction of such barriers. Through this VDOT policy, neighborhoods affected by high levels of highway noise can participate in the funding of barriers that would not otherwise be constructed.

Lead agencies for this response: VDOT

Coordinating agency(ies) for this response: DOT

Please identify a lead agency contact person: Amy Costello

Has this recommendation already been addressed, or is it in the process of being addressed? If so, please provide details.

VDOT adopted a Noise Abatement Policy based upon Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) regulations. The State Noise Abatement Policy (SNAP) provides opportunity for third party funding when the cost of a noise abatement measure exceeds VDOT's cost effectiveness ceiling but the measure otherwise satisfies the criteria contained in this policy. VDOT advises noise impacted property-owners of the SNAP through correspondence and through its external website.

If this recommendation has not been (or is not being) addressed, do you concur with the recommendation? Why or why not?

What, if any, actions should be taken pursuant to EQAC's recommendation?

Fairfax County should continue to use its proffer authority with developers to provide noise abatement measures and/or funding mechanisms to provide noise abatement measures consistent with VDOT noise abatement specifications. Fairfax County should also continue to coordinate with VDOT to determine where sound walls are already planned as part of a VDOT road construction project, which may offset abatement costs for the developer and/or VDOT. VDOT should continue to advise noise-impacted property owners of the SNAP including its third party funding option.

Do the actions recommended above have any budget implications for FY 2007? If so, please explain.

No budget implications are anticipated in FY 2007 based on the projects expected to be constructed by Fairfax County or by VDOT within the County in FY 2007.

Noise #3
Continued

Do the actions recommended above have any longer-range fiscal implications? If so, please explain.

With or without the EQAQ recommendation, the availability of the third party financing mechanism has potential longer-range fiscal implications to the County for those projects which the County or VDOT funds for which the State Noise Abatement Policy is applicable. This is due to the fact that noise barriers which exceed VDOT's cost-effectiveness ceiling would not be constructed at all, i.e., there would be no cost to a project, if the third party financing option were not provided. In the case of third party financing, the project pays the base amount per receptor for the noise wall up to VDOT's cost-effectiveness ceiling with the third party financing the rest.

Response to 2005 EQAC Recommendation

Recommendation: Noise #4

(Page 254 of the Annual Report on the Environment)

EQAC Recommendation:

When desired by the citizens most impacted, encourage the retention and planting of noninvasive vegetation to provide visual shielding from highways. Where possible, support the provision of vegetated areas adjacent to highways wide enough and dense enough to provide some noise reduction benefits. Where feasible and appropriate, pursue the combined use of plant materials and noise barriers.

Lead agencies for this response: DPZ (Planning Division)

Coordinating agency(ies) for this response: DOT

Please identify a lead agency contact person: Noel Kaplan

Has this recommendation already been addressed, or is it in the process of being addressed? If so, please provide details.

This recommendation is similar to a recommendation issued by EQAC in the 2004 Annual Report on the Environment. Therefore, the staff response is similar.

Fairfax County's Policy Plan recommends mitigation for highway noise impacts that are projected to exceed DNL 65 dBA in residential areas. For exterior noise mitigation, noise barriers are needed where outdoor recreational areas will be subject to these noise levels. While it would be ideal to locate new residential developments far enough from highways such that setbacks alone will provide for acceptable noise levels, the combination of land scarcity, high land costs, and extent of noise impacts along many of the county's roadways causes this idea to be impractical as a general rule. However, staff agrees with the idea of preserving and/or planting vegetation in addition to noise walls and appreciates EQAC's recognition that structural barriers are often needed.

The county's highway noise policy is implemented on a site-by-site basis during the zoning process. There are no County Code requirements for highway noise mitigation measures; rather, commitments to such measures are negotiated during reviews of residential rezoning applications (and, where applicable, special exception applications for residential cluster developments). Tree preservation and planting efforts are encouraged during the zoning process, and it is certainly desirable to retain existing vegetation along highways where practicable and to plant trees where preservation is impractical or where tree cover does not already exist; however, narrow bands of trees are ineffective as noise barriers and only provide psychological benefit. For a vegetated area to have a significant impact on noise, it must be dense enough so that it cannot be seen through and wide enough to provide a significant benefit. The Federal Highway Administration's Web site, for example, states that a 200-foot width of dense vegetation can provide a 10 decibel reduction in noise but notes that "it is often impractical to plant enough vegetation along a road to achieve such reductions."

Noise #4

Continued

Again, staff agrees with EQAC's recommendation to preserve and plant trees where possible adjacent to highways, generally in addition to, rather than instead of, more traditional structural barriers (either berms, walls, or combinations thereof). In staff's experience during the zoning process, the need for structural noise barriers in conjunction with residential development proposals near highways is nearly universal. Staff typically seeks, however, approaches to noise mitigation that are consistent with tree preservation and planting and feels that the planting and replacement of tree cover along either side of a structural barrier is appropriate, even if, as is often the case, it is not possible to preserve or plant a wide enough area of vegetation to provide significant noise mitigation.

Where noise barriers are constructed within the Virginia Department of Transportation right-of-way (either by developers in conjunction with residential development or by VDOT), VDOT construction and design standards will apply. The Fairfax County Department of Transportation participates in the design review of major VDOT projects in Fairfax County and generally supports preservation and planting efforts where appropriate, and when these efforts are consistent with VDOT design requirements.

If this recommendation has not been (or is not being) addressed, do you concur with the recommendation? Why or why not?

Staff concurs with the idea of maximizing tree preservation and/or planting near highways (and tree preservation and planting in general). We agree that preservation and planting efforts are appropriate and that such efforts should be pursued where possible to provide aesthetic, psychological, and other environmental benefits in conjunction with the provision of structural measures.

What, if any, actions should be taken pursuant to EQAC's recommendation?

Staff should continue to be sensitive to this issue during the zoning process and negotiate commitments for tree preservation and planting efforts to the extent possible in areas near highways. In addition, where consistent with tree preservation goals and where sufficient land is available, staff should encourage the use of landscaped berms and berm/wall combinations in order to minimize the adverse aesthetic impacts of noise barriers.

Do the actions recommended above have any budget implications for FY 2007? If so, please explain.

There are no budget implications for FY 2007.

Do the actions recommended above have any longer-range fiscal implications? If so, please explain.

There are no long-term budget implications.

Response to 2005 EQAC Recommendation

Recommendation: Noise #5

(Page 254 of the Annual Report on the Environment)

EQAC Recommendation:

Review all airport and highway studies that require Environmental Assessments or Environmental Impact Statements under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) for consistency with county policies addressing transportation-related noise and mitigation.

Lead agencies for this response: DPZ (Planning Division)

Coordinating agency(ies) for this response: DOT

Please identify a lead agency contact person: Noel Kaplan

Has this recommendation already been addressed, or is it in the process of being addressed? If so, please provide details.

EQAC's recommendation is identical to a recommendation in its 2004 Annual Report on the Environment. As the status of the recommendation has not changed, our response is similar:

This recommendation is being addressed as NEPA documentation is issued and provided to county staff. For example, in 2005, staff provided reviews of Draft and Final Environmental Impact Statements for proposed new runways at Washington Dulles International Airport and reviewed Environmental Impact Statements (including sections on noise) for the Tri-County Parkway and Battlefield Bypass. As Environmental Impact Statements and Environmental Assessments are issued for other airport-related projects and highway projects, staff will review and comment on these documents and include noise-related considerations in its reviews.

It should be noted that county policies related to transportation-generated noise focus both on the need for noise compatible land use decisions near existing and projected sources of noise as well as on the minimization of adverse environmental impacts associated with new transportation facilities and services. In evaluating land use proposals for consistency with airport and highway noise policy, the 24-hour average "DNL" metric is applied, consistent with general federal interagency guidance on transportation noise compatibility (e.g., for residential development near highways, the focus is on reduction of exterior noise impacts in outdoor recreational areas to DNL 65 dBA or less). However, the Federal Highway Administration and the Virginia Department of Transportation have more specific peak hour noise criteria for evaluating impacts of new highway projects and in designing noise barriers, and NEPA documentation for highway projects apply these guidelines in their analyses. County staff reviews noise issues within this context for highway projects that are subject to the NEPA process.

Noise #5
Continued

If this recommendation has not been (or is not being) addressed, do you concur with the recommendation? Why or why not?

Staff concurs with this recommendation and is addressing it on a continuing basis as NEPA-related documents are issued.

What, if any, actions should be taken pursuant to EQAC's recommendation?

Staff recommends that reviews of NEPA documents for highway and airport-related projects continue as noted above.

Do the actions recommended above have any budget implications for FY 2007? If so, please explain.

While staff resources are applied to the review of NEPA-related documents, these reviews are occurring, and will continue to occur, through the use of existing staff resources; no additional funding is needed.

Do the actions recommended above have any longer-range fiscal implications? If so, please explain.

No.

Response to 2005 EQAC Recommendation

Recommendation: Light Pollution #1a

(Page 265 of the Annual Report on the Environment)

EQAC Recommendation:

EQAC recommends that the Board of Supervisors ensure that the Fairfax County Park Authority and the Fairfax County Public Schools fully comply with the new Ordinance and consistently follow the recommendations of the Illuminating Engineering Society of North America. EQAC further strongly recommends that the Board of Supervisors appoint a small independent task force to develop recommendations and specifications for athletic field lighting throughout the County, and that these be used to amend the Outdoor Lighting Ordinance.

Lead agencies for this response: FCPA & FCPS

Coordinating agency(ies) for this response: None

Please identify a lead agency contact person: Charles Smith, Naturalist III, Natural Resource Management and Protection (703-324-8555; charles.smith@fairfaxcounty.gov)

Has this recommendation already been addressed, or is it in the process of being addressed? If so, please provide details.

It is the policy of the Fairfax County Park Authority (FCPA) to ensure that all new and replacement lighting projects are in compliance with the County's new Outdoor Lighting Ordinance, and follow the recommendations of the Illuminating Engineering Society of North America.

In November 2004, the Park Authority commissioned an independent technical consultant to (1) research currently available state-of-the-art athletic field lighting systems; (2) provide comparative analysis between those as well as more traditional systems; (3) provide a report summarizing the study and its findings; and (4) develop generic technical specifications for future FCPA athletic field lighting projects that are efficient and compatible with community needs.

The study focused on lighting criteria and equipment which provide for effective on-field lighting while efficiently controlling off-field light pollution such as spill light and glare that might adversely impact adjacent residential neighbors and properties. Improving operational efficiency and reducing costs were also significant considerations in the comparison of lighting products.

In August, 2005, the A&E consultant submitted a draft report of the study. This report and the study were presented at a public meeting on November 17, 2005. We received several comments at the meeting, that was followed by a 30-day public comment period. FCPA is currently reviewing and responding to the comments received.

Light Pollution #1a

Continued

Following the public meeting and comments, the study's report will be updated based on FCPA review, and a generic specifications for athletic field lighting will be developed for contracting future athletic field lighting projects.

A group of athletic field lighting projects was funded in the 2004 bond. The newly developed specifications will be used as the basis for the selection and installation of lighting system and equipment for these projects.

The Park Authority has also contacted the Fairfax County Public Schools official who provided comments at the November 2005 public meeting, to inquire and learn about the Public Schools' criteria and standards for athletic field lighting, and to offer coordination.

The Park Authority believes that its athletic field lighting study was developed and conducted in a professional manner. Therefore, it does not see the need for another study, by a separate task force, to develop similar recommendations and specifications.

If this recommendation has not been (or is not being) addressed, do you concur with the recommendation? Why or why not?

It has been addressed as outlined above.

What, if any, actions should be taken pursuant to EQAC's recommendation?

The Park Authority will continue to ensure that all new lighting projects are carried out in accordance with the Ordinance and recommendations of the Illuminating Engineering Society of North America.

Furthermore, the Park Authority will use the guidance set forth in the independent study to exceed the Ordinance standards wherever feasible in order to provide lighting for outdoor events while minimizing the impact of lighting on surrounding uses.

Do the actions recommended above have any budget implications for FY 2007? If so, please explain.

Because the Park Authority has been complying with these regulations already, there are no implications for the FY 2007 budget.

Do the actions recommended above have any longer-range fiscal implications? If so, please explain.

We do not believe this recommendation has any longer-range fiscal implications.

Response to 2004 EQAC Recommendation

Recommendation: Light Pollution #1b

(Page 265 of the Annual Report on the Environment)

EQAC Recommendation:

EQAC recommends that the Board of Supervisors ensure that the Fairfax County Park Authority and the Fairfax County Public Schools fully comply with the new Ordinance and consistently follow the recommendations of the Illuminating Engineering Society of North America. EQAC further strongly recommends that the Board of Supervisors appoint a small independent task force to develop recommendations and specifications for athletic field lighting throughout the County, and that these be used to amend the Outdoor Lighting Ordinance.

Lead agencies for this response: FCPA and FCPS

Coordinating agency(ies) for this response: None

Please identify a lead agency contact person: Dean Tistadt

Has this recommendation already been addressed, or is it in the process of being addressed? If so, please provide details.

This recommendation has already been addressed; Fairfax County Public Schools (FCPS) is compliant with the new light pollution Ordinance. Since the Ordinance was implemented in June 2003, FCPS has included it in the design guides and currently utilizes the recommendations of the Illuminating Engineers Society of North America (IESNA) in the design standards for all bond related projects. In addition, as lighting fixtures are replaced for maintenance purposes, FCPS is implementing the new standards and changing the fixtures to ensure we are compliant with the lighting standards.

Most of the parking lot lighting projects completed on school renovations and new buildings included in the 1995 and subsequent bonds meet the current outdoor lighting Ordinance. However, most building mounted lighting completed prior to June 2003 does not meet the current Ordinance. These fixtures will be upgraded to meet the new guidelines through natural attrition, as outlined in the Ordinance.

FCPS is willing to participate on a task force with the Fairfax County Park Authority to review and evaluate standards and technology for lighting of athletic fields countywide. However, current FCPS lighting standards are performing well and are in compliance with all local code requirements.

Light Pollution #1b
Continued

If this recommendation has not been (or is not being) addressed, do you concur with the recommendation? Why or why not?

This recommendation has been addressed.

What, if any, actions should be taken pursuant to EQAC's recommendation?

FCPS will continue to ensure that all new lighting projects are planned and completed in accordance with the Ordinance and recommendations of the Illuminating Engineering Society of North America.

Do the actions recommended above have any budget implications for FY 2007? If so, please explain.

We do not believe this recommendation has any FY 2007 budget implications because we are already in compliance with the regulations.

Do the actions recommended above have any longer-range fiscal implications? If so, please explain.

We do not believe this recommendation has any longer-range fiscal implications.

Response to 2005 EQAC Recommendation

Recommendation: Light Pollution #2

(Page 265 of the Annual Report on the Environment)

EQAC Recommendation:

EQAC recommends that the Board of Supervisors direct that all exterior lighting fixtures installed on Fairfax County facilities and properties be consistent with the new Ordinance and follow the recommendations of the Illuminating Engineering Society of North America. EQAC further recommends that the Board of Supervisors direct that all older lighting fixtures under county control that do not meet the above standards be replaced on a phased basis with the newer recommended fixtures. EQAC notes that these steps will lead to significantly lower energy costs that will recoup the costs of the changeover within a reasonable period of time.

Lead agencies for this response: DPWES (Planning & Design Division)

Coordinating agency(ies) for this response: DPZ (ZAD-Ordinance Admin.)

Please identify a lead agency contact person: Felix M. Bermejo, Team Leader, Streetlight Engineering Team, Planning and Design Division (Telephone No. 703-324-5814)

Has this recommendation already been addressed, or is it in the process of being addressed? If so, please provide details.

Exterior Lighting Fixtures

All new exterior lighting fixtures installed on Fairfax County facilities and properties are required to and will adhere to the recently adopted outdoor lighting standards of the County's Zoning Ordinance, i.e. "the Ordinance", and will follow the recommendations of the Illumination Engineering Society of North America. This requirement is applicable to all new County facilities and existing County facilities that are subject to renovations or modifications that include changes to the exterior site lighting.

The retrofitting of exterior lighting fixtures located at existing County facilities to meet the current outdoor lighting requirements of the Ordinance is not being pursued at this time as a stand alone initiative. However, as previously noted, the existing exterior lights will be upgraded to current standards as existing facilities are modified or renovated.

Older lighting fixtures under County control (streetlights)

Currently, all new cobra head streetlights are cutoff fixtures. Funding is not available to replace existing semi-cutoff streetlight fixtures with new cutoff fixtures. Currently, of the approximately 54,000 streetlights in the Fairfax County Streetlight Program, approximately 35,000 are semi-cutoff cobra head fixtures and 8,000 colonial semi-cutoff fixtures.

Light Pollution #2

Continued

Of the cobra head streetlights, approximately 23,000 utilize mercury vapor (MV) light source with the remaining 12,000 streetlights utilizing high-pressure sodium vapor (HPSV) light source. In many cases, cobra head streetlights may not meet current roadway lighting standards. As older cobra head fixtures are taken out of service they are replaced with cutoff fixtures.

If this recommendation has not been (or is not being) addressed, do you concur with the recommendation? Why or why not?

We generally concur with the overall recommendation. However, we do not believe that costs savings will be achieved by changing the fixture types to cutoffs. It is noted that (1) the operation and maintenance (OM) cost is same for both the HPSV semi-cutoff and HPSV cutoff fixture types and therefore conversion of those lights would not result in any OM saving. (2) The OM cost of the HPSV fixture is generally less than the cost of the MV fixture and therefore there would be some OM cost saving provided the number of fixtures does not increase. However, it is very likely that when converting from semi-cutoff to cutoff, more fixtures would be needed to maintain the same lighting pattern and, consequently, this may eliminate the OM cost saving or may even increase the OM cost.

What, if any, actions should be taken pursuant to EQAC's recommendation?

Negotiations are underway with Dominion Virginia Power to provide Colonial and Acorn streetlight fixtures with cutoff features to reduce sky glow and light trespass. Currently, Northern Virginia Electric Cooperation provides those fixtures with cutoff features.

Do the actions recommended above have any budget implications for FY 2007? If so, please explain.

The specific actions being taken at this time do not have any impact on the FY 2007 Budget. However, it is estimated that approximately \$20 million would be needed to convert all the existing 43,000 semi-cutoff cobra head and colonial fixtures to cutoff fixtures. This does not include the cost to install additional cutoff fixtures that may be needed to meet the applicable lighting criterion, which in turn would increase the overall OM cost. Currently, funds to convert the semi-cutoff fixtures to cutoff fixtures are not available or proposed in FY 2007.

Do the actions recommended above have any longer-range fiscal implications? If so, please explain.

Yes. Future OM cost would increase as the above recommendations are implemented.

Response to 2005 EQAC Recommendation

Recommendation: Light Pollution #4

(Page 265 of the Annual Report on the Environment)

EQAC Recommendation:

EQAC recommends that the Board of Supervisors continue to monitor and evaluate the effectiveness of the recently enacted Outdoor Lighting Ordinance to determine any areas in which enhancements and modifications may be needed and to ensure that lighting standards and practices and the reduction of light pollution in Fairfax County are comprehensively addressed.

Lead agencies for this response: DPZ (ZAD-Ordinance Admin.)

Coordinating agency(ies) for this response: None

Please identify a lead agency contact person: Lorrie Kirst

Has this recommendation already been addressed, or is it in the process of being addressed? If so, please provide details.

The current Zoning Ordinance outdoor lighting standards became effective on June 17, 2003. County staff continues to monitor the effectiveness of these standards and have found that the outdoor lighting regulations are overall effective in controlling glare and in reducing light levels in certain commercial developments. Staff's current monitoring activities include the observation of projects built pursuant to the current standards, discussions with industry, citizen input, and the number and type of outdoor lighting complaints received by the Zoning Enforcement Branch.

It is recommended that the current monitoring activities continue and that amendments to the outdoor lighting standards be considered as more projects are built under the current standards and as additional information is obtained. Any new recommendations by the Illuminating Engineering Society of North America, the organization that develops industry accepted lighting standards, should be considered. It is also recommended that a comprehensive review of the county's outdoor lighting standards be conducted within the next several years. If it becomes apparent that certain provisions require more immediate revision, interim amendments to the outdoor lighting regulations could be proposed.

If this recommendation has not been (or is not being) addressed, do you concur with the recommendation? Why or why not?

Not Applicable.

Light Pollution #4
Continued

What, if any, actions should be taken pursuant to EQAC's recommendation?

See Above.

Do the actions recommended above have any budget implications for FY 2007? If so, please explain.

No.

Do the actions recommended above have any longer-range fiscal implications? If so, please explain.

If the current lighting standards are amended and if the adopted changes require additional staff resources and/or equipment, there could be some longer-range fiscal implications.

Response to 2005 EQAC Recommendation

Recommendation: Light Pollution #5

(Page 265 of the Annual Report on the Environment)

EQAC Recommendation:

EQAC recommends that the Board of Supervisors support county staff efforts to develop any additional technical information that may be needed for the education of architects, contractors, electricians, and builders as to what the county permits and does not permit in the field of illumination and the technology available for compliant installations.

Lead agencies for this response: DPZ (ZAD – Ordinance Admin.)

Coordinating agency(ies) for this response: DPWES (Planning and Design); OPA

Please identify a lead agency contact person: Lorrie Kirst

Has this recommendation already been addressed, or is it in the process of being addressed? If so, please provide details.

In September 2003, staff published and distributed a 16-page booklet that provides a summary of the county's outdoor lighting standards. Although the booklet contains some technical information, it was designed for use primarily by homeowners, county staff and building industry professionals that are looking for guidance on meeting the current county outdoor lighting regulations. The booklet is available on the Department of Planning and Zoning's Web site. If any revisions to the outdoor lighting standards are adopted in the future, the 2003 booklet will be revised as necessary to reflect such changes. In addition, the Office of Public Affairs can distribute news releases and include information in its other publications and resources. At this time, there appears to be no immediate need to develop additional technical information to supplement the 2003 booklet.

If this recommendation has not been (or is not being) addressed, do you concur with the recommendation? Why or why not?

Staff is generally in agreement with the recommendation. The outdoor lighting standards were comprehensively changed in 2003 and it was anticipated that there would be a period of adjustment for those designing and installing lighting as well as for county staff that are responsible for site inspections and plan review. Although it appears that lighting professionals and staff are adjusting to the new outdoor lighting regulations, it is believed that the development of information to provide guidance on the selection of compliant lighting fixtures and how lighting can be applied in efficient and effective ways could be beneficial. However, such actions would require staff resources, thereby reducing available resources for other activities.

Light Pollution #5
Continued

What, if any, actions should be taken pursuant to EQAC's recommendation?

Staff should continue to monitor the effectiveness of the new outdoor lighting standards and to update the 2003 booklet if any changes to the outdoor lighting standards are adopted in the future.

Do the actions recommended above have any budget implications for FY 2007? If so, please explain.

No.

Do the actions recommended above have any longer-range fiscal implications? If so, please explain.

No.

Response to 2005 EQAC Recommendation

Recommendation: Visual Pollution #1

(Pages 270-273 of the Annual Report on the Environment)

EQAC Recommendation:

EQAC strongly recommends that the lack of an explicit provision in Article 12-300 of the present Ordinance for assessment of civil penalties be rectified at the earliest opportunity. It is recommended that Article 18-903 of the Ordinance be amended by deleting items 1.H and 1.I.. These provisions should be replaced by new, more comprehensive, language built directly into Article 12 as follows:

PART 4 12-400 VIOLATIONS, INFRACTIONS, AND PENALTIES

12-401 General provisions

- 1. Any sign erected, placed, or affixed contrary to any of the provisions of this Article or contrary to any provisions of any permit issued under this Article shall be, and is hereby declared to be, unlawful.*
- 2. Any person (whether owner, officer, lessee, principal, agent, employee or otherwise), corporation, or organization who violates any of the provisions of this Article, or permits such violation, or fails to comply with any of the requirements hereof shall be subject to the enforcement provisions of this Part.*
- 3. Upon becoming aware of any violation of any provision of this Article, the Zoning Administrator shall serve notice of such violation on the person committing or permitting the same, which notice shall require the violation to cease within such reasonable time as is specified in the notice. After such notice is sent and such violation is not ceased within such reasonable time as is specified in the notice, then the Zoning Administrator may proceed to remedy the violation as provided in Section 402 below. The Zoning Administrator may also revoke a residential or non-residential use permit to terminate the violation. Any written notice of the Zoning Administrator shall include a statement informing the recipient that a right to appeal the notice of a zoning violation or a written order within thirty days may exist in accordance with Sect. 15.2-2311 of the Code of Virginia and Part 3 of Article 18 of the Zoning Ordinance, and that the decision shall be final and unappealable if not appealed within thirty days. The appeal period shall not commence until such statement is given.*

Visual Pollution #1

Continued

4. In addition to the remedies provided in Par. 3 above, the Zoning Administrator may initiate injunction, mandamus, or any other appropriate action to prevent, enjoin, abate, or remove such erection, placement, or affixation in violation of any provision of this Article. Such action may also be instituted by any citizen who may be aggrieved or particularly damaged by any violation of any provisions of this Article.

12-402 Infractions and Civil Penalties

1. A violation of the provisions of this Article shall be deemed an infraction and shall be punishable by a civil penalty of \$100 for the first violation at a specific location; any subsequent violations at the same location arising from the same set of operative facts shall be punishable by a civil penalty of \$250 for each separate offense. Any violation arising from the same set of operative facts at the same location which persists for sixty (60) days or more may, at the discretion of the Zoning Administrator, thereafter be subject to injunction, mandamus, or any other appropriate action to prevent, enjoin, abate, or remove such violation.

2. Each day during which any violation of the provisions of this Article is found to have existed at the same location shall constitute a separate offense. However, in no event shall any such violation arising from the same set of operative facts at the same location be charged more frequently than once in any ten day period, nor shall a series of such violations arising from the same set of operative facts at the same location result in civil penalties which exceed a total of \$5000.

3. The designation of a particular violation of this Article at a particular location as an infraction pursuant to Par. 1 above shall be in lieu of criminal sanctions except for any violation resulting in injury to any person or persons.

4. After having served a notice of violation on any person committing or permitting a violation of the Zoning Ordinance provisions enumerated in this Article and if such violation has not ceased within such reasonable time as is specified in such notice, then, upon the approval of the County Attorney, the Zoning Administrator shall cause two (2) copies of a summons to be served upon such person.

5. Such summons shall contain the following information:

- A. The name and address of the person, corporation or organization charged.*
- B. The nature of the infraction and the Ordinance provision(s) being violated.*

Visual Pollution #1
Continued

- C. *The location, date, and time that the infraction occurred or was observed.*
 - D. *The amount of the civil penalty assessed for the infraction.*
 - E. *The manner, location, and time in which the civil penalty may be paid to the County.*
 - F. *The right of the recipient of the summons to elect to stand trial for the infraction and the date for such trial.*
6. *The summons shall provide that any person, corporation, or organization summoned for a violation may elect to pay the civil penalty by making an appearance in person or in writing by mail to the Department of Finance at least seventy-two (72) hours prior to the time and date fixed for the trial and, by such appearance, may enter a waiver of trial, admit liability, and pay the civil penalty established for the offense charged. Such summons shall provide that the signature to an admission of liability shall have the same force and effect as a judgment of court, however, an admission shall not be deemed a criminal conviction for any purpose.*
7. *If a person, corporation, or organization charged with a violation does not elect to enter a waiver of trial and admit liability, the violation shall be tried in the General District Court in the same manner and with the same right of appeal as provided by law. A finding of liability shall not be deemed a criminal conviction for any purpose.*
8. *The remedies provided for in this section are cumulative and not exclusive and shall be in addition to any other remedies provided by law.*

Lead agencies for this response: DPZ

Coordinating agency(ies) for this response: Sheriff's Office; OPA;VDOT; County Attorney

Please identify a lead agency contact person: Michael Congleton

Has this recommendation already been addressed, or is it in the process of being addressed? If so, please provide details.

The recommendation proposes the amendment of Article 12 of the Fairfax County Zoning Ordinance to include a civil penalty provision for all sign violations. Va. Code Ann. § 15.2-2209 (LNMB 2003) allows any locality to “adopt an ordinance which establishes a uniform schedule of civil penalties for violations of specified provisions of the zoning ordinance.” Zoning Ordinance § 18-903 (1) (H) has already designated violations of Zoning Ordinance §§ 12-104(1), (4), (5), (6), (7), (11), (12), (13), or (14) relating to the erection of prohibited signs on private

Visual Pollution #1 Continued

property are as punishable by a civil penalty of \$100 for the first violation; any subsequent violation is punishable by a civil penalty of \$250, with total fines of not more than \$5,000. These fine amounts are identical to those proposed in the EQAC recommendation. Except for those signs that do not require a permit under Zoning Ordinance § 12-103, any sign that is erected, altered, refaced, or relocated requires a sign permit that has been approved by the Zoning Administrator under Zoning Ordinance § 12-301, and a violation of Zoning Ordinance § 12-301 has also been designated as a violation that is subject to a civil penalty under Zoning Ordinance § 18-903(I).

Violations of Article 12 that have not been designated punishable by a civil penalty are currently deemed misdemeanors and, upon conviction, are punishable by a fine of not less than \$10 and not more than \$1,000. Failure to abate such violations within the time period established by the Court shall constitute a separate misdemeanor, which is punishable by a fine of not less than \$10 nor more than \$1,000, and any subsequent failure to abate the violation during any succeeding 10-day period constitutes a separate misdemeanor offense for each 10-day period, which is punishable by a fine of not less than \$100 nor more than \$1,500. The Zoning Administrator also has the option of enforcing any violation of Article 12 by requesting declaratory and injunctive relief in the Circuit Court.

However, EQAC should be aware as provided in last year's response that the Board of Supervisors is considering entering into an agreement with the Commonwealth Transportation Commissioner pursuant to Va. Code Ann. § 33.1-375.1 (LNMB Supp, 2005), which would permit the county to enforce the provisions of Va. Code Ann. § 33.1-373 (LNMB 2005), which prohibits advertising in the public rights-of-way. Va. Code Ann. § 33.1-373 provides for a civil penalty of \$100 for each violation of that section and for injunctive relief for recurring violations.

If this recommendation has not been (or is not being) addressed, do you concur with the recommendation? Why or why not?

The existing enforcement remedies have proven to be effective in dealing with violations of Article 12. As a result no change is recommended other than the possibility of the Board of Supervisors entering into an agreement with the Commonwealth Transportation Commissioner as explained above.

What, if any, actions should be taken pursuant to EQAC's recommendation?

This recommendation should be forwarded to the Board of Supervisors for their consideration.

Visual Pollution #1
Continued

Do the actions recommended above have any budget implications for FY 2007? If so, please explain.

N/A

Do the actions recommended above have any longer-range fiscal implications? If so, please explain.

N/A

Response to 2005 EQAC Recommendation

Recommendation: Visual Pollution #2

(Pages 273 and 274 of the Annual Report on the Environment)

EQAC Recommendation:

The Fairfax County Sign Task Force made several recommendations. EQAC strongly urges the Board of Supervisors to again consider the Task Force's report and either implement its findings or reconstitute the Task Force to find alternatives that are more palatable to the Board and citizens of the county.

- After holding a public hearing, the Board, pursuant to Virginia Code §33.1-375.1, should enter into an Agreement with the Commissioner of VDOT to enforce Virginia Code § 33.1-373. The Agreement would provide for sharing civil penalties collected after the county's costs have been recovered. [The Task Force provided a draft Agreement for the Board to consider.]
- The county should fully support the county Sheriff's program of using inmates for removal of roadside litter, including removal of signs illegally posted in a right-of-way.
- The county should implement a pilot project of approximately six months to determine whether additional resources are needed, and if so, develop a list of alternatives for further evaluation and ranking in terms of cost benefit analysis for the Board to use as it decides whether to expand the Agreement or move in a different direction.
- The county should conduct an information and public outreach program regarding restrictions of signs in the public rights-of-way and any new county program to prosecute sign violations.
- The county Executive should send letters to public entities within the county advising them of illegal signs and outcomes of posting same.
- The Board should invite VDOT to consider implementing in Fairfax County additional possible deterrents to minimize illegal signs in the rights-of-way.
- As part of its Legislative Program, the Board should seek an amendment to the Code of Virginia that would declare all signs illegally posted in a right-of-way to be abandoned and, therefore, illicit trash that may be removed by anyone.

Visual Pollution #2

Continued

- If the above is not successful or possible, then the alternative is to seek an Amendment to the Code of Virginia that would permit individuals, as opposed to organized groups, to participate in the Adopt-A-Highway program to remove or cleanup illegal signs as duly authorized representatives of the Commissioner.
- The County should seek an Amendment to the Code of Virginia placing reasonable limitations on political campaign signs in the right-of-way. The County should offer recommendations for limits on the number, minimum distance between individual signs, and the time frame for posting and then removing the signs.

Lead agency for this response: DPZ

Coordinating agency(ies) for this response: Sheriff's office, OPA, VDOT, County Attorney; Legislative Liaison

Please identify a lead agency contact person: Michael Congleton

Has this recommendation already been addressed, or is it in the process of being addressed? If so, please provide details.

As noted in last year's response, the General Assembly adopted an amendment to Va. Code Ann Section 33.1-375.1, that was recommended by the Sign Task Force and provides authority for Fairfax County to enter into an agreement with the Commonwealth Transportation Commissioner to enforce Va. Code Ann. Section 33.1-373, which prohibits advertising within the limits of any highway. However, any enforcement agreement is subject to the provisions of §33.1-375.1(C), which provide that political signs and special event signs may remain in the rights of-way for three days after an election or the special event, and that other signs and advertising may remain in the rights-of-way for no more than three days. The amendment became effective July 1, 2003. Prior to the implementation of any enforcement program, the Board of Supervisors is required to hold a public hearing on whether the Board should enter into such an agreement. Staff of the Zoning Enforcement Branch of the Department of Planning and Zoning is in the process of formulating a proposed approach for implementing an enforcement program should the Board decide to enter into such an agreement. It is anticipated that this work will be forwarded to the Board of Supervisors in February 2006. While progress has been made this year in the formulation of the program, it has been necessary to divert the staff resources responsible for this assignment to other pressing needs, principally to work on Zoning Ordinance amendments which have been given an extremely high priority by the Board. Additionally, the significant amount of time spent by the Zoning Administrator and management staff of the Zoning Enforcement Branch on such issues as work program changes, overcrowding, litigation efforts, and responding to the numerous "hot button" issues that invariably arise in the zoning administration line of business, has impacted their ability to invest the quality time necessary on this item. It is anticipated however, that by the spring of 2006, appropriate staff resources can again be devoted to this effort. To date, as part of the development of this program, staff contacted the staff of Prince William County, who recently implemented such a program. It is anticipated that other county agencies will be included in the design of the program, including

Visual Pollution #2

Continued

the Office of the County Attorney, the Department of Public Works and Environmental Services, the Virginia Department of Transportation, and the Office of the Sheriff. Staff will also develop a campaign to publicize the program and educate/inform the community and public agencies of the regulations and the enforcement effort. At the end of the first year of the program, the county will review the results of the program and make a determination if additional resources are required and consider possible retention, modification and/or expansion of the program.

The Office of the Sheriff has offered to assist the county in dealing with illegal signs on public rights of way in Fairfax County through the Community Labor Force programs. The CLF programs provide an innovative alternative to incarceration and work release. Labor crews, consisting of well-screened offenders under the supervision of deputy sheriffs, provide necessary services to the county, such as graffiti removal, blight abatement, county wide litter pick-up, bus stop maintenance, and landscaping at public facilities. While the CLF program could become a cost effective tool in the implementation of the sign enforcement program, the Sheriff's Office has noted that given it's current initiatives, the CLF program will only be available to address sign removal in a limited capacity.

As to the recommendation regarding a legislative change to the Adopt-a-Highway programs to include individuals, a legislative change is not required because changes to the program are policy decisions of the Virginia Department of Transportation.

Regarding the recommendation for an amendment to the Code of Virginia, declaring all signs illegally posted to be considered illicit trash, such legislation was considered in 2004 and not recommended by the Board of Supervisors last year.

The General Assembly in its 2004 Session considered House Bill 804, which addressed issues related to the classification of political signs as advertising and limitations on the number, minimum distance, and time limits for these signs. This bill was sent to the Privileges and Elections Committee in December 2004, and no further action has been taken.

If this recommendation has not been (or is not being) addressed, do you concur with the recommendation? Why or why not?

Not applicable.

What, if any, actions should be taken pursuant to EQAC's recommendation?

See above.

Visual Pollution #2

Continued

Do the actions recommended above have any budget implications for FY 2007? If so, please explain.

This issue will be reviewed as part of the formulation of the proposed sign enforcement program should the county decide to enter into an agreement with the Commonwealth Transportation Commissioner. It is anticipated that if current staffing levels are not reduced, the proposed study can be accommodated within existing funding levels.

Do the actions recommended above have any longer-range fiscal implications? If so, please explain.

There may be potential long range fiscal implications if the Board enters into an agreement with the Commonwealth Transportation Commissioner and the sign enforcement program is successful and implemented on a countywide basis, requiring additional staff resources.

Response to 2005 EQAC Recommendation

Recommendation: Visual Pollution #3

(Page 274 of the Annual Report on the Environment)

EQAC Recommendation:

The Environmental Quality Advisory Council supports the general premise underpinning each of the Task Force's recommendations above, but believes that before the county seeks major amendments to the Code or introduces new programs of its own, a study should be performed to determine the impact on existing programs, staffing, and budget, and that a cost benefit analysis determine the extent to which the proposed amendments or additions would contribute to reducing visual pollution in a cost effective manner, having due regard for the possibilities of cost recovery through the rigorous imposition of civil penalties.

Lead agency for this response: DPZ

Coordinating agency(ies) for this response: Sheriff's office, OPA, VDOT, County Attorney

Please identify a lead agency contact person: Michael Congleton

Has this recommendation already been addressed, or is it in the process of being addressed? If so, please provide details.

As part of the development of this sign enforcement program, staff will identify the impacts on existing programs, staffing and budgetary considerations which will be presented to the Board of Supervisors. A cost benefit analysis for a sign removal program may be conducted upon the conclusion of the first year of the program.

If this recommendation has not been (or is not being) addressed, do you concur with the recommendation? Why or why not?

Not applicable.

What, if any, actions should be taken pursuant to EQAC's recommendation?

See above.

Do the actions recommended above have any budget implications for FY 2007? If so, please explain.

N/A

Visual Pollution #3
Continued

Do the actions recommended above have any longer-range fiscal implications? If so, please explain.

The Sheriff's Office is currently involved in numerous projects to address visual pollution. Assuming additional responsibilities associated with the code enforcement of illegal signs addressed in the Annual Report would require additional staffing and funding.